DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 574 95 SP 011 000

TITLE The Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies.
INSTITUTION Optimum Computer Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 18 Mar 75
CONTRACT OEC-0-74-3345
NOTE 67p.; Report of U.S. Delegation to OECD Conference (Paris, France, November 26-29, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; *International Organizations; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Supply and Demand; *Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS *Organisation for Economic Cooperation Development

ABSTRACT

This report of the American Delegation to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies is a six-part document presenting: (1) names and affiliations of the U.S. delegates; (2) an executive summary; (3) the OECD Conference Report; (4) report of the first post-conference meeting of the U.S. delegates; (5) recommendations to the U.S. Commissioner of Education; and (6) report of the presentation to the Commissioner. The Executive Summary presents a brief history of the development of the OECD, main topics of concern at the conference (Changing Context of the Professional Activity of Teaching, Changes in Working Conditions and in the Need for Teachers, New Standards for Teacher Education, and Consequences for Costs and Planning). The OECD Conference Report details background information on the OECD and presents viewpoints evolving from the four working sessions, arranged in summaries of (1) group discussions derived from pre-Conference meetings, (2) delegate viewpoints, and (3) comments from the American delegation. The report of the first post-Conference meeting of U.S. delegates presents the topics discussed at the meeting, including future plans for the delegation as a whole, and a critique of the draft conference report. Comments and recommendations of the U.S. delegation are presented in general form and, in more specific terms, on the problems of planning and management, professional status, roles of teachers and administrators, scope of service, and educational community/government relations. The section "Presentation to the Commissioner" contains remarks made by delegates and the Commissioner of Education at the Report Presentation luncheon. (MB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED138574

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

United States Delegation to OECD

THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE ON TEACHER POLICIES

Paris, November 26-29, 1974

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
OECD CONFERENCE REPORT
FIRST POST-CONFERENCE MEETING
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSIONER
PRESENTATION TO THE COMMISSIONER

Submitted to
THE UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
Dr. Terrell H. Bell

SP 011 000

Prepared pursuant to Contract Number OEC-0-74-3345 with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education by Optimum Computer Systems, Inc. Education and Human Resources Development Division.

CONTENTS

Page

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION iii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

OECD CONFERENCE REPORT 5

FIRST POST-CONFERENCE MEETING 49

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSIONER 53

PRESENTATION TO THE COMMISSIONER 57

3

THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE ON TEACHER POLICIES, PARIS: NOVEMBER 26-29, 1974:

United States Representative to the Conference:

United States Office of Education
Dr. William L. Smith, Director, Teacher Corps

The Delegate Organizations and their Representatives:

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
Dr. Sam P. Wiggins, President

American Association of School Administrators
Mr. Elden M. Amundson, Vice President

American Federation of Teachers
Mr. Albert Shanker, President

Council of Chief State School Officers
Dr. Jack P. Nix, President

Education Commission of the States
Mr. Robert H. McBride, Chairman of the Policy Committee

National Association of State Boards of Education
Mr. Robert H. McBride, President

National Congress of Parents and Teachers
Mrs. Lillie Herndon, President

National Education Association
Mr. James A. Harris, President

National Institute of Education
Dr. Garry McDaniels, Director, Programs on Teaching and Curriculum

National School Boards Association
Mr. Philip B. Swain, President

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) established in 1961, comprises 24 member nations (plus two special status nations, New Zealand and Yugoslavia), the great majority of which are western European. OECD evolved from the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), established in post-World War II Europe to administer the Marshall Plan. OECD seeks to meet the evolving need for a world view in economic planning, and to this end has granted member status to the United States, Canada, and several other non-European nations.

OECD's aims are to build cooperation among its member nations, to serve their financial needs, and to plan future economic and cultural development. A number of directorates have been established, each of which functions as a special-area working group. Member nations assign permanent representatives to the OECD and to its directorates and committees. These act as clearing houses, compiling data and disseminating information within individual problem areas. OECD holds conferences, inviting Member nations and others to submit papers and attend conference sessions. Though agreements growing out of conferences are not binding upon the governments of Member nations, the cohesive effect of these guidelines for action on economic, cultural and other matters has been considerable. Some 200 conferences were convened at OECD's Paris headquarters in 1974.

The Education Committee (Directorate for Social, Manpower and Educational Affairs) has been largely concerned with education development policies and their effect on social and economic growth. Its primary focus has been to increase access to education, expand training in technical fields, and exchange methodologies for improving education systems. Increases in per capita spending for education programs and institutions remain a basic goal.

During the past three years, the Education Committee has in some measure redirected its priorities. The drive for increased investment in education now includes increased attention to the management of education systems and to the whole area of innovation. In addition, Education Committee policies now reflect the greater importance attached to early childhood education and to the quality of postsecondary education.

The Education Committee recognizes that quantitative gains in the provisions of education do not necessarily lead to qualitative improvements. Expanded opportunity of access to education requires broadened access to achievement in education; without this, entry becomes irrelevant.

In view of these and other trends, the Education Committee designated a working committee to organize an Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies (Paris, November 26-29, 1974). The conference was organized around four topics:

I. The Changing Context of the Professional Activity of Teaching
II. Changes in Working Conditions and the Need for Teachers
III. New Standards for Teacher Education
IV. The Consequences for Costs and Planning

Member nations were invited to submit papers presenting national policies and experiences within these areas. Most nations sent delegations of government officials, with the addition in many cases of trade union representatives. The U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Terrell Bell, however, appointed a delegation consisting of the elected leaders of a widely varied group of organizations.

The eight delegates, (listed on page iii), reflect a broad spectrum of opinion in education, coming from groups representing colleges of teacher education, State and local boards of education, school administrators, parents and teachers, all representing the interests of American citizens concerned with the Nation's education system. The Federal Government was represented by two persons: Dr. William L. Smith, Director of the U.S. Teacher Corps (Delegation Chairman) and Dr. Garry McDaniels, representing the National Institute of Education.

Optimum Computer Systems, Inc. (OCS), the contractor retained by the Office of Education, hired consultants to undertake necessary research on the four topics. OCS then synthesized the research findings into a draft of the United States contribution to the OECD conference on Teacher Policies.

Each member of the U.S. Delegation received the draft and prepared comments. The Delegation met in Washington on August 29, 1974, to review the draft report and consider additional materials from their organizations. The delegates agreed to send recommendations and additions to OCS within a week. Most had been received by September 5, and final editing commenced.

The representatives of the National Education Association voiced strong concerns and requested (1) additional time for reviewing the draft and (2) a meeting between appropriate NEA and OCS staff members. The OCS Project Manager and Senior Editor attended a meeting at NEA and brought away 5 pages of annotation on the document.

Final editing had already incorporated many NEA suggestions into the document. Revisions not already made were added. The final draft reflected almost all suggestions provided by the delegates, including those in the five-page NEA memorandum. The United States position paper thereby became a joint product of the delegates.

The Institute for International Studies in the Office of Education reviewed and approved the final draft. It was then translated into French, and the French and English language versions were printed. Copies in each of the two languages were forwarded to the OECD Secretariat.

On November 26, 1974, prior to the opening session of the Paris Conference, the Delegation met with the United States Ambassador to the OECD, Mr. William C. Turner to discuss the history and background of OECD. Ambassador Turner traced the development of education as a focus of interest within the broader and primary context of OECD as an economic organization. Mr. Martin C. Forrester, Advisor to the Ambassador on Education and Manpower then briefed the Delegation on the Conference and its likely outcomes. A luncheon meeting followed, chaired by Mr. Forrester and Mr. Serge Foy of the Advisor's Office, at which the delegates assumed their working group assignments.

Mrs. Herndon (NCOPT) and Mr. Shanker (AFT) served as delegation representatives to Working Group I (The Changing Context of the Professional Activity of Teaching); Messrs. Amundson (AASA), Harris (NEA) and Swain (NSBA) served as delegation representatives to Working Group II (Changes in Working Conditions and the Need for Teachers); Dr. Smith (USOE) chaired, and Drs. Nix (CCSSO) and Wiggins (AACTE) served as delegation representatives to Working Group III (New Standards for Teacher Education); Dr. McDaniels (NIE) and Mr. McBride (NASBE) served as delegation representatives to Working Group IV, (Consequences for Costs and Planning). After considerable discussion of procedures to be followed by the Delegation, such as debriefing schedules, social and other activities, the meeting adjourned.

The delegation attended the opening plenary session at which Madame Bodil Skjanes-Dugstad (Norway; President of the Conference) addressed all participants. She emphasized that the conference theme led directly to the political nature of education: the debate would thus be about power, its nature, its availability, and its exercise.

The second and third days were devoted to the Working Group sessions. While most of the discussion was inconclusive, there were items of major concern to specific Member countries. The following were of critical importance to all.

That teachers must be able to play a part in developing their own identity; that there is a need for clear identity without uniformity; and that existing training arrangements did not always lead to the desired new identities in either initial or inservice training were concerns generally agreed upon. The structure of the profession was also held to influence diversity. The problem of quantifying and subsequently costing the demand for teachers in the new conditions was a dominant theme in most groups. Consideration of demand for planning was seen as an inevitable prelude to any wider consideration of development.

Themes of broad significance which emerged in the working groups were:

Group I - The Changing Context of the Professional Activity of Teaching

There was agreement that schools must play an active role in preparing pupils for a rapidly changing society, and that teachers play a significant role in the personality development of their pupils.

The Group agreed that teachers should have decisionmaking powers, that schools should enjoy autonomy, and that the needs of individual communities must be recognized.

The topics of decentralized professional support and professional mobility were also dealt with.

Group II - Changes in Working Conditions and the Need for Teachers

Discussion focused on the fact that in all Member countries society is undergoing rapid change. Not all existing teachers are fully aware of changing demands upon their professional skills. Staffing needs of individual schools vary. Innovation in teaching requires involvement of teachers in developmental and updating activities and evaluation of their own techniques and practices. Leadership will involve staff consultation. More teachers' time will be required.

Human resources will be needed in complementary relationships to work of teachers. These include professionals, administrative, clerical, technical and manual aides. Pupils and local community are also seen as resources. Material resources will be needed; buildings, media, study programs and teaching materials.

Issues of class size, teacher surplus, manpower needs, re-entrance to teaching and unqualified teachers were also discussed.

Group III - New Standards for Teacher Education

Access to the profession was discussed at length. It was agreed that some selection was inevitable; access of adults was considered as well as more flexible training structures. It was hoped that initial training could soon be planned everywhere in the context of life-long training. The Group agreed that priority should be given to recurrent education for teachers in planning and financing education systems, and that this would necessarily require additional expenditure.

Group IV - Consequences for Costs and Planning

The increase in costs is practically universal. The problem is to establish a link between costs and benefits as concerns (a) pupils and the community (b) teachers (c) the issue of centralization or decentralization (d) individualization of teaching. Class size, qualification of teachers, planning responsibility, school size and the role of teachers in planning were all discussed at length.

On Friday, November 29, 1974, a Delegation meeting took place in the Ambassador's conference room. During the meeting, the Delegation worked out basic philosophical and policy considerations. The delegates agreed that a follow-up meeting would be desirable. This was scheduled to take place in San Francisco on January 23, 1975. Dr. McDaniels undertook to make a major presentation at that meeting on a "Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study", designed to identify teacher characteristics and skills in terms of student performance and attitudes in reading and mathematics at the second and fifth grade levels.

The Delegation attended the final plenary session during which reports of each of the working groups were presented. General discussion and, in some cases, debate ensued until the Conference adjourned. The American delegation then taped a round-table discussion of conference issues at the OECD studios--to be broadcast at a later date. On the evening of the final day, Ambassador Turner held a reception for the members of the Delegation.

OECD CONFERENCE REPORT

CONTENTS

Page

I. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Background........ 7

II. The Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies: Report of the American Delegation to the U.S. Commissioner of Education........ 10

III. Working Group 1: The Changing Context of the Professional Activity of Teaching........ 12

IV. Working Group 2: Changes in Working Conditions and in Needs for Teachers........ 20

V. Working Group 3: New Standards for Teacher Education........ 28

VI. Working Group 4: Consequences for Costs and Planning........ 39

VII. General Conclusions: Prepared by OECD Rapporteur........ 43

I. THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Background

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), established in 1961, comprises 24 member nations (plus two special status nations, New Zealand and Yugoslavia), the great majority of which are western European. OECD evolved from the Organization of European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), established in post-World War II Europe to administer the Marshall Plan. OECD seeks to meet the evolving need for a world view in economic planning, and to this end has granted member status to the U.S., Canada and several other non-European nations.

OECD aims to build economic cooperation among its member nations, to serve their financial needs, and to plan future development. A number of directorates have been established, each of which functions as a special-area working group. Member nations assign permanent representatives to OECD and to its directorates and committees. These act as clearing houses, compiling data and disseminating information within individual problem areas. OECD holds conferences, inviting member nations and others to submit papers and attend conference sessions. Though agreements growing out of conferences are not binding upon the governments of member nations, the cohesive effect of these guidelines for action on economic, cultural and other matters has been considerable. Some 200 conferences were convened at OECD's Paris headquarters in 1974.

The Education Committee (Directorate for Social, Manpower and Educational Affairs) has been largely concerned with education development policies and their effect on social and economic growth. Its primary focus was to increase access to education, expand training in technical fields and exchange methodologies for improving education systems. The achievement of increasing per capita spending for education programs and institutions remained a basic goal.

During the past three years, the Education Committee has in some measure redirected its priorities. The drive for increased investment in education now includes increased attention to the management of education systems and the whole area of innovation. In addition, the Education Committee has adjusted its policies to reflect the greater importance now attached to early childhood education and to the quality of postsecondary education.

The Education Committee recognizes that quantitative educational improvement does not necessarily lead to qualitative improvement. Expanded opportunity of access to education requires broadened access to achievement in education; without this, entry becomes irrelevant.

In view of these and other trends, the Education Committee designated a working committee to organize an Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies (Paris, November 26-29, 1974). The Conference was organized around four topics:

I. The Changing Context of the Professional Activity of Teaching

II. Changes in Working Conditions and in the Need for Teachers

III. New Standards for Teacher Education

IV. The Consequences for Costs and Planning

The United States Position Paper

Member nations were invited to submit papers presenting national policies and experiences within these areas. Most nations sent delegations of government officials, with the addition in many cases of trade union representatives. The U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Terrell H. Bell, however, responded by designating a delegation consisting of the elected leadership of a widely varied group of organizations. These leaders are listed on page iii.

The eight delegates reflect a broad spectrum of opinion in education, coming from groups representing colleges of teacher education, State and local boards of education, school administrators, parents and teachers, all representing the interests of American citizens concerned with the Nation's education system. The Federal Government was represented by two persons: Dr. William Smith, Director of the U.S. Teacher Corps (Delegation Chairman) and Dr. Garry McDaniels, representing the National Institute of Education. All ten delegates contributed to the United States' position paper. This document provides a comprehensive survey of activities in education and its development in the United States at this time.

Basic research in each of the four topic areas was conducted by a group of consultants, each of whom had particular expertise in specific areas of education. These consultants were retained by Optimum Computer Systems, Inc. whose Education staff, pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, synthesized the research findings into a draft of the United States contribution to the OECD conference on Teacher Policies.

This draft was then sent to each member of the U.S. Delegation for comment. A meeting of the delegation took place in Washington on August 29, 1974, the express purpose of which was to go over the draft report and gain the various organizational inputs. In considering changes they felt necessary, the Delegates agreed to send further recommendations to Optimum within a week. By September 5, 1974, most of these recommendations had been received and additional editing of the document commenced.

The representatives of the National Education Association had some strong concerns and requested additional time for consideration of the draft. They also requested a special meeting between their staff people and representatives of Optimum. The Project Manager and an Optimum Editor attended this meeting in the NEA offices and at its conclusion, emerged with 5 pages of notes on specific points within the document which NEA felt needed changing.

Editing of the draft had progressed to the point where many of the suggestions of NEA had already been incorporated into the document. Those issues of concern not already part of the document were subsequently worked in and the final draft contained almost all suggestions provided by the represented groups, including the NEA five-page memorandum. With the inclusion of all these inputs the United States position paper could be viewed by the Delegation as its own.

The final draft was reviewed by the Institute for International Studies, and with their approval, was translated into French and both the French and English versions were printed. The United States position paper in both languages, was then forwarded to the OECD Secretariat.

All the delegates agreed to reconvene in the United States for post-conference discussion. In this paper are presented in brief the conference viewpoints of the representatives of the groups within the U.S. delegation. It is hoped that this delegation can become a national working group of major forces working together to improve the Nation's education.

II. THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE ON TEACHER POLICIES: REPORT OF THE AMERICAN DELEGATION TO THE U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Introduction

Any report on the Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies, held in Paris, November 1974, under the auspices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) must first stress certain facts about the Conference if it is to be of value to the reader. Key among these are:

(1) The Conference had as its participants national delegations. In the case of the United States, the delegation was made up of ten persons (see page iii), of whom eight represented education organizations of national scope and importance. These included teacher, parent, and local school-board representatives. The ninth member of the delegation represented the National Institute of Education, a constituent body of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the tenth the Office of Education. He also served as the official U.S. representative, and chaired the delegation. A majority of other national delegations, it should be noted, were largely composed of government officials responsible in part or in full for the development of national teacher policies.

(2) The Conference did not seek to highlight critical problems; it addressed Teacher Policies in their broadest context.

(3) The Conference did not set out to formulate minimum standards, basic policies, or administrative or instructional procedures in any area of education or teacher employment; it sought to provide a forum in which national delegations could share their individual experience of common problems and to arrange for the more regular and comprehensive exchange of profession-related information and research findings.

As a result of these aims and of the modus operandi (four major discussion groups addressing a four-item agenda), viewpoints rather than resolutions resulted. These are summarized in this report.

Prior to the Conference the OECD Secretariat circulated some 30 documents (either working papers or submissions on topics generated by Member nations) to participating Member nations and to those due to attend the Conference in other capacities. Not all of the papers supplied directly addressed topics on the Conference agenda; all, however, related to these topics and contributed to an understanding of their broader implications. It should be noted in connection with the provision of these documents that the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP) protested that it had received no invitation to participate, and that no teacher organization had participated in planning the Conference. WCOTP further noted that a previous conference (Special Intergovernmental Conference on the Status of Teachers, Paris, October 1966) had strongly recommended a greater role for teacher organizations in the determination of education policy. The Confederation's position paper discussing these and other agenda-related issues was accepted and circulated at the Conference by the OECD Secretariat. The Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC), formally invited to participate, also protested, in the course of participation by its seven member delegation, the lack of teacher organization input into the planning phase.

The purpose of producing these materials was, in part, to provide national delegations representing widely differing education systems with access to a common body of relevant materials on significant topics. The subsequent provision of detailed discussion papers (based on materials previously supplied) to the four working groups continued and strengthened this attempt. Member delegations thus had a logical and integrated set of topics on which each delegation could expand upon common themes by introducing more specialized information reflecting its national experience and current objectives. Plans for accomplishing this were discussed.

In any event, not all topics on the agendas for the four working groups were addressed. Those that were did not receive equal attention or, in all cases, proceed to useful or usable conclusions. All four working groups, however, produced final reports.

This report has been designed to reflect the most significant findings of the four working groups within the context of the Conference agenda. Each group was assigned a specific agenda topic. To preserve sequence and clarity, each topic has been presented in a separate section containing:

(1) A summary of the group discussion paper provided by the OECD Secretariat, derived from pre-Conference preparation meetings.

(2) A summary of delegate viewpoints, drawn from OECD's Conference reportage.

(3) Pertinent comments from the American Delegation, generally focused on American concerns.

Thus the reader of this report will have an indication of the scope of the OECD Conference. One document, General Conclusions (the work of OECD's Conference Rapporteur), has been reproduced in full to conclude this report. It constitutes a valuable addition insofar as it captures the atmosphere and the underlying themes of the conference, reporting not the specific statements of individuals or delegations, but reflecting the sense of common concerns and shared challenges of a profession assessing its responsibilities in a time of change and of new horizons.

III. WORKING GROUP 1: THE CHANGING CONTEXT OF THE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY OF TEACHING

A. SUMMARY OF "DISCUSSION PAPER" PREPARED BY OECD SECRETARIAT

The Problem

A good relationship between education and society is dependent on the ability of the schools to relate to rapid social change. Teachers, as specialists, should participate in decisionmaking, since theirs is the responsibility to implement new policies. This requires an examination of ways to improve teachers' professional environments including consideration of how well current career patterns can adapt to an opening up of the schools to the outside world; increased dialogue within schools; and recognition of the teacher as a key participant in successful innovation. New resources would be required in some but not all areas of these proposed contextual changes.

1. The Teachers' Role in the Personality Development of Their Pupils (The Teacher and Inequality; The Extent of Teachers' Responsibilities and Their Role as Experts)

The stress by education systems on cognitive achievement in pupils has caused certain teachers to adopt attitudes which can heighten social, personal and economic inequalities. Innovations designed to increase cognitive achievement likewise can exacerbate these inequalities. Teachers must therefore reassess their responsibilities for their pupils' overall social development, and coordinate their contributions with those of other agents and mechanisms within the framework of a wider social policy. The teacher, traditionally considered responsible for all that occurred within the class, had the tendency to protect it from outside influences. If the school can no longer be considered a closed world, ways must be examined to modify teachers' responsibilities so that interaction with the external world can increase the range of social and personal forces that enhance pupils' social development.

The teacher will have to consider working with other education specialists in this endeavor with consideration given to the ways in which these agreed upon needs modify teachers' roles and responsibilities.

A clear definition of these exact responsibilities must be made because the recognition of these responsibilities by the authorities sets the conditions for teachers' personal and social development as well as the requirements for teacher education. The British White Paper of 1972 in projecting university training for the teaching profession supports a renewed status of the teacher as an expert. Two major approaches to innovation require exploration: use of specialized in-school teacher groups to train other teachers (pioneered in the United States), or maintenance of existing staff statuses and the slow infusion of innovation through traditional ex-teacher administrators, improved teacher-training, greater school autonomy, and the use of specialists to complement teachers' work (the basic European approach).

2. Participation and Powers of Decisionmaking (The Limits to Autonomy of Decision; Arbitration in Areas of Conflict; Overall Participation; Participation at the Local Level)

Greater teacher autonomy in decisionmaking increases the possible range of teacher roles and precludes narrow definition of them. Both the general conditions in which the teacher functions and the limits to autonomous decisionmaking must be considered in assessing the teachers' broadened activities. Conflict arbitration may be needed to help teachers overcome antagonism, which may emerge from their own differing views about their roles, those of the schools, the community or the wider society. In this context a new role for the school inspectorate might be considered.

With regard to overall participation, distinction should be made between formulation of education objectives and management of school establishments. The former usually takes place at a high political and administrative level among representative organizations. At this level there may be insensitivity to the need for change. Exchange of information can be enhanced through public relations directed towards two-way communications between periphery and center.

Local participation of teachers requires distinction between management roles, open to all concerned with the functioning of schools, and roles open to teachers as a professional group. A sharing by Member countries of the experiences to date of both groups would be of value, especially with regard to the reactions of teacher groups in school boards or other committees created to deal with objectives and functions of school resources and evaluation of results.

3. Decentralized Professional Support (A Definition; Improving Decentralized Professional Support)

Several kinds of support measures could be adapted to encourage teachers to alter set traditional patterns and adopt expanding roles. Six major support sources should be explored: (1) initial and continuing training; (2) supplementary human and material resources for schools involved in innovations; (3) discussion among specialized teachers and administrators at the local level; (4) distribution of specialized documentation on teaching; (5) introduction to the use of materials and various media; and (6) consultation with specialists in new teaching methods and education research and development in general.

Among facilities offering significant methods for increasing teacher acceptance of role expansion are Teacher Centers (British) and Centers for Pedagogical Documentation (French). These institutions, and those developed in other countries, warrant study and evaluation by Member nations.

4. Professional Mobility and the Renovation of Career Patterns (External Mobility; Internal Mobility; Career Patterns and Status Hierarchy; Possible Rewards for the "Dynamic Teacher")

There is need for more flexible entry-exit in the teaching profession, so experienced practitioners can temporarily leave and subsequently re-enter. Similarly, greater mobility within the profession should be encouraged, facilitated by more common-core and inservice training. Career patterns need to be made more attractive to prevent the "creaming off" of superior classroom teachers into school administration or into teaching at higher levels. Changes in existing hierarchical structures should be considered. One method is to develop new hierarchical patterns based on specialization of tasks. This would "reproduce" certain values which characterize the world of industry and technology, and which, given the prestige attached to their members, can persuade the community to accept changes.

Another possible approach, advanced by teacher organizations, among others, is to reject hierarchical structures, working instead toward "upward" unification of all personnel, and offering status and salary improvements to those who lead the way. Incentives other than the salary increase might be linked to the different stages of a career.

5. Specific Cost Implications

Cost implications are significant insofar as innovation and changing teacher roles require additional expenditure, as do improved plants and facilities. In addition, equitable financial incentives and rewards for teachers and retrained teachers would probably require additional overall funding, despite increased efficiency and productivity that may be achieved and considered as offsets to cost.

B. SUMMARY OF "REPORT OF GROUP DISCUSSION" PREPARED BY OECD RAPPORTEUR, WORKING GROUP 1

The Problem

There was agreement among delegates that the schools must take an active role in the broad social changes occurring around them to better prepare their pupils to face the changing world. At the same time, they expressed caution with regard to change for change's sake. Significant numbers of teachers and administrators feel that too much innovation, not well-researched, may have been implemented without sufficient consideration to pupil benefits.

The group felt that methodology and technology have changed rather than the teacher's fundamental role and that the basic teaching-learning process remained largely unchanged.

The Teachers' Role in the Personality Development of Their Pupils

Delegates agreed that teachers played a role in the personality development of their pupils, but there was little agreement on the teacher's influence in enabling pupils to overcome "inequalities." Doubts were expressed about whether certain types of "inequalities" could ever be overcome--different connotations exist for different users of the term. The Discussion Paper suggested that emphasis on "cognitive aspects" of learning tended to increase inequalities. A broader curriculum would provide more pupils with the opportunity to master a body of knowledge within their range of interests and capabilities. In the later school years, the more rigorous instruction in specialized fields had a tendency to emphasize inequalities, though at all levels, this can be counteracted by the encouragement of divergent and creative thinking. Delegates agreed that in order to play a greater role in personality development of pupils teachers must not only be "expert" in their fields but also in basic processes of teaching and learning, as well as in the personality development of children.

If teachers are to play an active role in the personality development of pupils, the question of their ability to influence content of material taught arises. No agreement was reached on this, however it became apparent that the degree of control over curricular content varied widely among member countries. The greater the extent to which this control over specific content is held by teachers, the more desirable it is for teachers, especially of young children, to interact and cooperate with parents.

Participation and Powers of Decisionmaking

The lengthy discussion on this topic led to agreement that teachers should indeed have powers of decisionmaking in schools and schools, as institutions, should possess a considerable degree of autonomy while recognizing community needs. This situation exists to differing degrees in different member countries. Delegates pointed out that while teacher control of their discipline is extremely rare, there is a growing tendency for teachers, functioning within professional "teams" to have greater "control" over the evaluation of their competency.

Delegates recognized that the formulation of the education system's objectives and operational framework are still dealt with at political levels, though teachers now have greater than previous roles in policy making and in policy interpreting. Locally, teachers are becoming more involved in management functions of their schools.

Fuller local participation in control of fiscal policy was discussed as an "ideal." In some member countries, mechanisms exist to share government funds and equalize the tax base to favor poorer socioeconomic areas so that they may afford better educational facilities.

Decentralized Professional Support

Delegates showed support for this concept and generally agreed on the suitability of the basic mechanisms (referenced in the discussion paper summary) through which it could be expressed. Several delegates suggested that Teacher Centers, currently emphasized in Britain and some places in the United States, are more effective if organized and sponsored locally rather than centrally.

4. Professional Mobility and the Renovation of Career Patterns

"Mobility" was treated both from internal and external viewpoints. From the external, delegates felt it unrealistic to expect a career teacher to enter a new vocation without appropriate training outside of the school. Conversely, while non-certified "experts" were a valuable resource, they required professional training before entering upon teaching.

On the question of internal mobility, delegates disagreed as to the appropriateness of "portable" qualifications between primary and secondary schools. In some Member countries basic qualifications are the same in both "panels" and mobility is encouraged. Delegates strongly stressed that all questions of mobility should be treated in the context of providing the best learning experiences for pupils.

Maintaining the dynamic teacher in the classroom through increased salary was not widely favored, although it is being tried in some Member countries. It was noted that people entering the profession with experience in other professions should receive some recognition for their related experience.

C. COMMENTS FROM AMERICAN DELEGATES

American delegates to Working Group 1 were Lillie E. Herndon (President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers) and Albert E. Shanker (President, American Federation of Teachers).

Mrs. Herndon noted that she was the only parent representative attending the conference. Her identification of herself as a parent representative seemed to cause a degree of initial surprise. In most OECD Member nations, parents apparently played a less significant and seemingly less formalized role in education. Several delegates said their countries were moving "cautiously" toward greater parent involvement. In addition, several delegates expressed the opinion that the American system of decentralized education must be "awkward and unwieldy." While there was little agreement on most issues, there was some on the point that the teacher's role in social change, decisionmaking, political activity and in reducing inequality of education will expand in the immediate future.

Mrs. Herndon stressed the importance of education within the economy of any country, and found it appropriate that education is becoming more significant within OECD activities.

Mrs. Herndon also commented that the choice of representatives by Commissioner Terrell H. Bell from among education policymakers, planners and practitioners enabled the American delegation under the leadership of Dr. Smith, to demonstrate the working of many components within the education system, including parents, who "have a major responsibility" for the education of their children.

She added that the general position of NCOPT is that:

- the millions of parents who belong to the NCOPT share a common creed in the work they do for children.

- they believe that children are best served by close cooperation between the two groups must intimately and deeply concerned with their welfare--parents and teachers.

- the NCOPT should blend the spirit of the home with the spirit of the school. Thus parents and teachers can cooperate intelligently in their efforts to improve the quality of education that children receive.

- they further believe that parents, by working as equal partners with teachers in the local parent-teacher associations, can help to secure for all youngsters the highest advantage in physical, mental and social education.

With these goals in mind, NCOPT parents everywhere today strive to participate in the decisionmaking processes that establish those policies which determine the success or failure of the public schools. Further, Mrs. Herndon expressed appreciation for Dr. Smith's able leadership of the Delegation and fine representation of the United States.

Mr. Shanker outlined the AFT position, stating that despite dissimilarities in the control and structure of education, Member nations are faced with many common problems. It is recognized that further reforms are needed to meet changing societal needs. General consensus among delegates on the nature of the problems contrasted with differences in opinion regarding solution. This demonstrated the need for further dialogue and research.

Education research must address long-range needs in cooperation with all segments of the education community. Societal problems cannot be isolated from their effects on schooling; conversely, schooling cannot be separated from its effect on society.

The rapid rise of unemployment in many countries has now left vast numbers of professionals without jobs. Teachers are among those most seriously affected. Inflation and recession have precipitated broad-scale cutbacks in education budgets. As a result, there has been a reduction in the teacher force. Simultaneously there has been an erosion of educational quality and an increase in class size. These events have combined to create the illusion of a "teacher surplus." The problem, however, is real. In the United States it is estimated that in 1976, for each teacher employed, there will be one unemployed.

These are a pool of highly skilled and highly motivated people. It would be tragic if we allowed ourselves to view such a vast untapped natural resource as another welfare burden. Rather than waste this workforce, those concerned with education should now investigate the means and benefits of utilizing this resource. Education priorities must be integrated with social needs. In this context, a program of universal lifelong education has far-reaching implications.

Individuals develop as much as 50 percent of their mature intelligence between conception and age four. Another 30 percent develops between ages four and eight. There have also been dramatic increases in the number of working mothers, particularly those with children under six years old. Yet no country offers a universally accessible program of early childhood education. To accomplish this, early childhood education for ages three to five must be incorporated into public education. Public school systems already have established mechanisms for the enforcement of standards, licensing of personnel and accountability for funds. Declining enrollments accompanying the fall in birth rates have provided the necessary space. Public school sponsorship of preschool programs would additionally assure continuity between the curriculum at this level and the primary grades. Present research indicates that preschool gains frequently diminish by the age of seven, eight or nine. Some ascribe this to existing differences in curriculum orientation.

At the other end of the spectrum, we err in perpetuating the notion that at age 16, 18 or 21 education ends, to be replaced only by work and retirement. In this manner, vocational and avocational needs of large segments of the population go unmet. Dropouts and others, rather than being locked into the consequences of one-time mistakes, should be provided with "second chance" opportunities. The benefits to society as a result of extending the accessibility of continuing education programs to women, minorities, senior citizens, individuals institutionalized in hospitals or prisons, among others, would be immeasurable. Career mobility, both external and internal, depends upon the availability of job retraining programs and inservice education. Learning pursued outside career concerns should be expanded as an integral part of the public education process. As support to flexible and open education opportunities, workers should be entitled to a leave of absence every seven years to further accommodate career and personal interests. The consequence would be a more productive and enriched society.

Effects of early childhood education and continuing adult education would be the long-range savings of vast sums of money, at present spent on remediation, rehabilitation, unemployment and welfare. More important is the chance to drastically reduce poverty, human degredation and suffering. Not until human needs win priority over creating military hardware and sustaining excess profits will people be able to realize their full human potential.

Changes in the extent and quality of education necessitate reforms in teacher education. Of crucial importance is the development of a well-researched technology of teaching which defines specific teaching skills. Additionally, beginning teachers should go through a period of two or three years in an internship program where they do not have full responsibilities.

During their first year, they should, in fact, have no responsibility for teaching. There should be a great deal of observation and planning; and very slowly over that two year period of time, they should be given an opportunity to go into the classroom and try things out--to plan them strictly on an internship basis, with other teachers helping out. Continuing inservice programs designed by teachers themselves are likewise needed to maintain excellence in teaching. Implementation of these reforms and solution of concomitant problems will require that new relationships be formed between the schools and institutions of higher education.

Members of the American delegation and those from other countries at the OECD Conference have taken an important initial step in addressing problems in education common to most nations. This in itself will not eliminate the underutilization of teachers, improve teacher preparation, nor raise the overall quality of education. The AFT will continue to work toward these goals through its collective bargaining and legislative efforts and through continued cooperation with OECD and with the organizations represented in the American Delegation.

IV. WORKING GROUP 2: CHANGES IN WORKING CONDITIONS AND IN THE NEED FOR TEACHERS

A. SUMMARY OF "DISCUSSION PAPER" PREPARED BY OECD SECRETARIAT

The Problem

The discussion paper developed the theme that rapid socio-economic change creates confusion in teachers' roles and tasks and demands greater effort and involvement from them. Change also affects teacher supply and demand and the allocation of existing resources in education. Balance must therefore be sought.

1. Specific Implications of New Tasks (Developing Cooperation; Developing Specific Training Activities)

One of the main causes of change in teacher tasks is the acceptance that teaching must be adapted to pupil needs. The traditional concept of the teacher working alone with pupils is difficult to sustain. The multiple strategies of new instructional approaches normally require joint work by a number of teachers. How can cooperation and sensitivity to wider problems be increased? How can teachers' individual talents and personal interests contribute to a cooperative framework? Do current experiments of educational teams provide a vehicle? New types of training are required, both individual and collective, each requiring different implementation, support, and participation methods. Underlying questions remain. What reasonable expectations may be held of teachers as initiators or developers of new methodologies? Will these be derived from teachers' experience and devised by them despite normal requirements on their time, or will this function remain with the university?

2. Changes in Working Conditions (Greater Flexibility in Statutory Obligations; Making Programs and Timetables More Flexible; New Resources to Help Teachers Carry out Their Tasks; Management of Resources)

Expanded tasks require greater resources and greater flexibility in their utilization. However, most existing legislation on budgets, teaching loads, and class size, as well as the rigid character of timetables, limit flexibility.

New resources are required if teachers are to be able to carry out the additional tasks created by increased flexibility. Education-related specialists, assistants (teaching or administrative), adults with specialized experience and pupil-monitors can be used, but their numbers, costs, duties, interaction and contributions must be assessed. The physical resources which change requires include more flexible architecture and the use of non-school and community buildings for part of the education process. Consideration should be given to increased use of media and establishment of guides for media use. Similarly, models of study programs and guides to materials should be developed and professional support established to assist users. Greater emphasis must be given to developing the teachers' capability as managers of resources and environment. There is misplaced apprehension about the use of these resources. Teachers would reap future benefits in terms of status resulting from these greater responsibilities. Changes should be made in the middle-management of schools--especially the decentralization of authority at this level--to make increased flexibility a workable concept.

3. The Needs for Teachers (The Inadequacy of the Concept of Pupil/Class Ratio in Evaluating Long-Term Needs; The Changing Pattern in the Need for Teachers; Cost Implications)

Short-, medium-, and long-term needs must be separately analyzed, with the realization that decreasing class size alone is not sufficient to increase pupil achievement. In a large number of Member countries there is felt to be an overall surplus of teachers. However in certain countries this is accompanied by a marked shortage in certain sectors and in certain disciplines at certain levels and in certain kinds of teaching. This reveals a rigidity in the supply system of graduate teachers which is totally unadapted to the demand.

In the context of a greater use of adults with life experience how can we ensure that those without officially recognized credentials can formally become qualified through new certifying procedures?

Cost considerations must be explored when new flexibility in teacher use is developed: some costs can be compensated for internally through increased services and productivity; others will be additional.

B. SUMMARY OF "REPORT OF GROUP DISCUSSION" PREPARED BY OECD RAPPORTEUR, WORKING GROUP 2

The Problem

Delegates noted that large-scale immigration to a number of Member countries has added to problems caused by rapid socioeconomic change and by new patterns in family life--among which is the increasingly common situation of two working parents. There is need to individualize instruction and to break away from traditionally rigid forms of teaching into new patterns of relationships, and to use new methods, new technologies and other aids. Teachers will need to work in teams, assume new tasks, acquire new skills and take students' views on curriculum and methods into account.

(1) Not all teachers are aware of changing demands on their professional skills nor are they willing to accept new roles.

(2) In Member countries, existing rules governing appointment and certification of teachers and the determination of timetables might tend to inhibit movement toward greater flexibility.

(3) For initiatory work in curriculum development and for participation in fundamental research, teachers will need encouragement and appropriate inservice training.

(4) Leadership roles of head teachers and supervisors need to be identified, and the individuals concerned need special training.

(5) A greater commitment of teachers' time will be required. This will involve more generous provision of teacher resources and supporting services. Educationalists must present the case for educational advance so as to minimize attacks upon the level of educational expenditure generally.

Resources to Help Teachers

The utilization of increased resources (both human and technological) was intensively debated. Some delegates feared that the new infusion of specialists (psychologists, evaluators, media technologists, etc.)--though valuable to the schools--might fragment the teacher's central role. Others simply feared the supply of specialists might be inadequate to meet the wishes of teachers and schools.

All agreed that welfare, health and education professionals should work together. Contact in the course of their training would give each insights into professional problems of the other.

Nonprofessional staff are valuable as teacher and administrative aides, but should not be employed in teaching situations. Similar conclusions were expressed about the teacher's use of pupils. Though they could, through helping other pupils, strengthen and broaden their own development, they should not be considered as a formal teaching resource or assigned as teacher aides. A majority of delegates agreed that benefits could accrue from involving the local community in the work of the schools.

Delegates came to a number of widely supported conclusions about physical plants. Many existing buildings are inadequate and exercise a cramping effect on innovation and on the use of education technology and media resources. Part of the higher cost of suitable new buildings could be offset if they were constructed to be multi-use, community-oriented structures, rather than restricted to purely academic uses and purposes.

The support function of new media was discussed, with the finding that teachers should retain control of them and their use. Facility in the use of recently developed curricular, media, and resource materials should be aimed at through inservice training. As with study programs and teaching materials, media resources should be designed as teaching supports and not as prescriptions of what teachers should do. Those technological or media resource items too expensive for individual schools should, delegates concluded, be considered in terms of district or regional availability, rather than be rejected.

The Needs for Teachers

Most delegates held class size to be important in effective teaching, though accepting that achievement tests did not always provide correlations between smaller class size and higher pupil-achievement. Teacher recruitment and training planning was, in most Member countries, predicated upon the maintenance of a small-class policy. Delegates also emphasized that much of the innovation developed to facilitate individualized instruction assumed small-class size. All agreed that the smaller class led to better pupil-teacher and teacher-parent relationships, and enhanced teachers' roles in the personality development of their pupils.

Delegates felt that the "teacher surplus" had been measured only in terms of unemployed teachers: unmet educational needs should also be applied as a measure, and, as such, might indicate a very different situation, especially in terms of the availability of specialized skills.

Member countries need to assess and forecast the whole spectrum of educational manpower needs, including specialized support personnel. With re-entry into teaching, qualified ex-teachers tend to bring maturity, wider experience and stability to the field. Less than fully qualified persons successfully practicing in the profession should be given the means to complete speedily their formal qualifications, with recognition being given to service to date.

C. COMMENTS FROM AMERICAN DELEGATES

American delegates to Working Group 2 were Elden M. Amundson (Vice President, American Association of School Administrators), James A. Harris (President, National Education Association), and Philip B. Swain (President, National School Boards Association).

Mr. Amundson's position, as representative of the AASA, follows. He stressed that with the growing interdependence among the nations of the world and the changes occurring in the society of all countries it was timely as well as appropriate for representative of both the teachers and school authorities of various nations to hold an intergovernmental conference on the subject of education.

The OECD is, therefore, to be commended for taking the initiative to arrange for this significant conference.

Although the Conference was designed to focus upon "Teacher Policies," the teacher occupies such a central role that any consideration of such a theme naturally touches upon most of the education spectrum. While participating teachers and governing authorities of education reached only limited consensus, the dialogue, nevertheless, proved helpful in providing all a somewhat more realistic perspective toward policies relating to teachers.

Because education affects the economies of individual nations as well as the world, the problems of allocating adequate resources becomes critical. Though the conference produced few guidelines for such allocation, important considerations were expressed. Between some teacher representatives' belief that more Government dollars placed at the teachers' disposal will solve problems, and the inclination of central authorities toward largely arbitrary judgements in resource allocation and utilization there will develop, it is hoped, a rationale for supporting and implementing education.

Even though the so-called labor-management role of teachers and school administrators has tended to polarize their relationship, there were modest expressions of hope for a more unified profession. Realization of this will depend upon the level of statesmanship both parties demonstrate in the years ahead. At present teachers are more preoccupied with furthering their own interests. Administrators and governmental authorities, in being reluctant to share decision-making with teachers, are also guilty. The Conference brought out the differences with which these two groups view their respective roles.

As discussion progressed, an acceptance of the trend to view education within the context of the whole society rather than as an entity unto itself evolved: the future public support of education will demand the entry of education into harmony with the whole society. Although teachers have historically considered their profession as uniquely apart, slowly and with some skepticism a realization is emerging that in their changing roles teachers will increase their effectiveness through utilization of the insights of other professions and resources provided by technology. In this conference on "Teacher Policies," the pupil did not get much consideration beyond impressive sounding platitudes. If education is to be brought into harmony with society, its primary purpose--serving the learner--must be placed and kept in its proper perspective.

Though the benefits of this conference are difficult to evaluate so soon after its conclusion, it was timely and valuable to the U.S. Delegation. It is to be hoped that participants will relate with a broader perspective to their national colleagues as they further deliberate on "Teacher Policies"

Recognizing that teacher-pupil interaction is the point at which the success of our educational system is largely determined, the AASA wishes to record its firm support for all efforts which strengthen teachers' capabilities. Our Delegation's proposal to follow-up the Paris Conference with a national effort to emphasize improving the professional preparation and in-service training of teachers, is therefore also a movement which the AASA strongly supports.

Dr. William Smith is to be commended for the able leadership he provided. Without his wise counsel and direction our mission would have been less successful than it was.

Mr. Harris, President of the NEA, presented the views given hereunder.

At the Conference, the representatives of teacher organizations were outnumbered by governmental officials. This was also obvious in the composition of the American delegation, which had at least some teacher representation.

There was insufficient teacher organization involvement in the preparation for the conference. There was some input, for instance, into the preparation of the U.S. position paper; however, the U.S. position paper contained inaccuracies, and seemed to have a basic objective of cutting costs regardless of the consequences, with a concomitant neglect of the most important product--the students.

Teachers are well aware of their new responsibilities but often restricted by governmental rules and regulations.

The Conference's strong points were that there was some teacher involvement, though greatly limited, and that representatives of teacher organizations of the various countries could meet within an intergovernmental conference. It did bring together teachers, planners, and policymakers.

The weakest points of the conference were the ambiguities of the discussions, the poor initial preparation for the position papers, the lack of teacher involvement in the preparation, the feeling that non-teachers were to make decisions for which they were poorly equipped by knowledge, interest or training.

We do not accept the suggestions that initial training of the teacher can be replaced by recurrent education; that savings are effected through increased class size.

If research on class size is to be meaningful, it must be done with full teacher participation from the beginning. The so-called "evidence" on class size presented in the initial document is nonscientific in character, opinionated and biased. Even Mr. Douglas A. Pidgeon, whose research on the topic formed the basis for the OECD statement in the working documents, stated in a group meeting that the conclusion drawn from his work was a "travesty." Teachers do believe that human relationships can be more effectively developed in smaller classes.

The so-called surplus of teachers has been too readily accepted without regard to the need of more teachers in order to provide adequate educational opportunities at all levels. The underutilization of existing professional personnel has caused the surplus.

Planning in education cannot be effective unless from the very beginning teachers, through their own organizations, serve as equal partners with the governmental authorities.

Good education costs money. If the objective is established that the saving of money is the important thing, then the discussions of a "good, sound teacher policy" are not realistic. Reform and innovations in education are not primarily to save money, but to improve education and to provide adequate educational opportunities.

Time must be made available for the teacher to make innovations; at present, they can think about change in their spare time on a voluntary basis. It must be remembered that a great percentage of the public believes in the traditional tasks of education more than in innovations.

Innovation per se is not necessarily good.

Teachers in the United States are aware of their responsibilities; they do make efforts to acquire the education which will prepare them to be active in educational change; they do discharge their functions effectively; they do want a more satisfactory status. That is why teachers are better prepared than ever before; are constantly seeking meaningful inservice training; have organized into organizations in order to negotiate effectively for the improvement of education and the betterment of their status. Yet, they must negotiate with governments for the very things the conference was designed to consider.

Mr. Swain stated that whatever benefits would derive from published conference outcomes could have been secured with less expense of time and money by straightforward fact-gathering and dissemination. Educational problems, in his view, are internal rather than international in nature. It is not therefore necessary that there be coordination of plans and policies in order to take into account the impact on country "A" of what is being done or proposed in country "B."

Briefings by the U.S. Ambassador and his staff gave the Delegation an understanding of OECD, its history and its current role. The composition of the U.S. Delegation was responsible for the most significant benefit derived from the Conference. Significantly, the opportunity was presented--and used--for members of the Delegation to meet away from home and to engage in frank, non-controversial interchange on subjects of importance to U. S. education. Representatives returned home much more aware of the constraints under which their colleagues function as organizational representatives. Mr. Swain hopes to interpret this for NSBA and help pave the way for joint action on matters on which NSBA can agree with other organizations and for more understanding of disagreement on others.

Mr. Swain noted a preponderance of governmental personnel on the official delegations of most of the participating countries. The United States Delegation was a notable exception to this pattern.

Members of TUAC (OECD's Trade Union Advisory Committee) played a major role although they were not members of national delegations. That role consisted of TUAC position papers which were introduced at the first general session, before discussion of the agenda had begun, and by frequent intervention in the sub-group sessions which were held on the Conference's second and third days.

In Working Group 2 (The Change in Working Conditions and in the Need for Teachers), by far the greater part of the time was devoted to:

- rationalization and defense of positions
- intradelegation differences of opinion (e.g., United Kingdom, United States)

- comments from the TUAC viewpoint, including reiterated objections to the failure of some countries to include union representatives on their delegations.

- momentum towards arriving at some sort of statement which, on behalf of the group, could be presented to the general session on the Conference's fourth day.

V. WORKING GROUP 3: NEW STANDARDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

A. SUMMARY OF "DISCUSSION PAPER" PREPARED BY OECD SECRETARIAT

The Problem

Conditions of access, initial training and the context in which a teaching career begins determine teachers' attitudes toward their profession and toward needed change. Because a substantial number of teachers have been trained in a traditional manner, there is urgent need for inservice programs to update teacher knowledge. Traditional teacher training institutions are seldom equipped to adapt to change or address more than a narrow segment of the labor market. They frequently lack the resources and personnel necessary for broadly based approaches. Some measures to improve teacher education can be realized through better utilization of existing resources; in most cases, however, new resources will be needed.

1. Access to the Teaching Profession (Possibilities of Self-Selection; Place of Life Experience and Qualified Adults; Flexibility in Training Structures)

At present, increasing numbers of candidates pursuing a largely fixed number of training slots tends to strengthen purely academic selection criteria for entry into pre-service programs. Since no valid criteria have been developed to assess inherent suitability, candidates should be exposed to the profession and its demands so they can themselves evaluate the strength of their commitment. Such an approach might well decrease dropout rates during training or upon commencement of teaching.

Recognition of the importance of balanced personality and knowledge of the environment in which pupils live has brought into question the practice of recruiting young people only to the teaching profession. Recruitment of larger numbers of mature adults to the profession may be of particular value. Their life experience outside the academic sector may give them the capacity to perform this personality development role well.

As self-selection toward, and early exposure to, the teaching profession increase, more flexible training structures will be required. These should be suited to the candidates' own needs and experience; should enable some to specialize rapidly and others to deepen their interest in the profession; should offer possibilities of reorientation for students who decide they are unsuited to teaching; and should ensure appropriate practical arrangements for courses (full-time, part-time, sandwich courses, etc.). This may well necessitate a closer look at general policies governing access to higher education in an effort to accomodate a wider range of candidates.

2. Initial Training Period (Possibilities for Self-Education; Coherence of Training; Specific Content of Training; Role of Research and Development; Length of the Initial Period of Training)

Significant changes are required in initial training, which, in brief should be (1) the basis for continuing training which supports initial training, (2) relevant to the various functions the teacher performs, (3) not removed from the spirit which should govern teachers' relationships with their pupils and with their colleagues, (4) a means by which teachers develop enquiring, critical minds which encourage them to improve their teaching, and (5) enable the future teacher to acquire a greater flexibility to adapt to different educational situations and innovations.

The self-selection process would become more significant if accompanied by real possibilities for self-education to promote the teacher's growth and development. This would require skilled help and advice from experienced colleagues to guide the new teacher in further development. A common base would be needed in the training of primary and secondary teachers, with specialization occurring later in the training process.

The content of teacher training requires reassessment so that training in the human and social sciences can be combined with professional training. This will enhance teachers' abilities to understand their pupils' social and intellectual development and to interact with pupils, colleagues and the community. This change should be arranged to reduce authoritarianism in pedagogical relationships, to sensitize teachers' expectations of their pupils, to promote cooperative work and inter-teacher dialogue and to train teachers to manage the education resources needed for their pupils' learning.

As these changes occur, coherence between new teachers and their more experienced colleagues can be strengthened by providing the new teacher opportunities to assume progressively greater responsibilities. It would therefore be advisable to consider the kinds of measures which might provide for: (1) an adequate number of schools prepared to accept trainees, (2) school pedagogical teams to aid trainee teachers, (3) teams from the colleges of education and schools where clinical practice is proceeding (in order to integrate theoretical and practical aspects of training), and (4) by ensuring the presence of trainee teachers in schools in order to promote innovations.

If teachers are to master varied teaching strategies, greater emphasis must be given to educational research and development. Currently few teacher training institutions have the human resources required to progress in this area. In this context adjustment of national legislation should be considered to allow for the systematic development of training models and ultimately broadly skilled teachers.

Renovation of teacher training will cause debate on the optimal length of initial training, as well as the theory/practice mix for each type of teacher.

3. Further Training Period (First Year of Professional Experience; The Different Types of Continuing Education; Teacher Participation in Determining Teachers' Needs)

In transforming the content and methods of initial training, the goal is to develop in the teacher an awareness of the need for continuing training. This new approach will only affect a limited number of new teachers. However, steps must also be taken to ensure that the need for in-service training for more traditionally trained teachers is also met.

Of key importance in any teaching career is first year experience and performance. This should be aided by the provision of professional support. New teachers should be given reduced teaching assignments to enable them to: (1) reduce the intensity of effort normally required, (2) enable them to extend their knowledge in the context of personal and vocational education and (3) establish contacts with colleagues, in order to learn the general functioning of the school.

Examination of continuing education for teachers requires a look at whether teachers should be entitled to educational leaves, with or without requirements as to their use. Existing legislation in Britain, France and Sweden might be studied in connection with their differing approaches to this problem.

If teachers are to be offered a sufficient range of inservice training options, new and expanded training facilities will be required. One alternative could be provided through the creation of self-education collectives working in and through existing institutions.

4. Institutional Responsibilities for Training

Implementation of improved and more sensitive inservice training should avoid the restrictions imposed by working within existing institutions and facilities. Older and narrowly focused institutions could consider converting themselves into polytechnics offering open and flexible forms of training. Changes of the nature of those proposed will require considerable coordination. In this connection, consideration should be given to (1) the role of schools as locations for the "clinical" education of the student-teachers; (2) to possible links between university and non-university institutions; (3) to the role of specialized centers of professional support and research and development; and (4) to teacher assignments in firms and social institutions, etc. The creation of management consortia might prove an economical and flexible solution to the problem of coordination

Cost Implications:

The expansion of pre- and inservice training has cost implications for salary scales, for the provision and staffing of facilities, and for equipment. Full evaluation of all cost components is, therefore, a prerequisite to the implementation of change and should be a permanent factor in national planning.

B. SUMMARY OF "REPORT OF GROUP DISCUSSION" PREPARED BY OECD RAPPORTEUR, WORKING GROUP 3

Delegates agreed on the significance of the points referenced in the discussion paper.

1. Access to the Teaching Profession

Delegates agreed that some selection was inevitable and that it should become part of the continuous experience of the candidate with a view toward achieving self-determination. They agreed that the complexity of the problem made criteria for selection difficult to define. They also recognized that the ideal teacher should be able to (1) adapt to new situations and (2) be an active participant at various levels of education. This would require linkage between practical, theoretical, scientific and academic training. Diversification of functions and team work would be necessary to meet the aims of the contemporary education. Delegates felt that this new approach could aid in selection.

Delegates considered the problem of access of adults into the teaching profession on the basis of their social experience. They felt that definition of specific abilities of the teacher was difficult--that motivation and committment were of greater importance than any particular professional qualities. Thus, more flexible training structures and broadly based access seemed necessary.

2. Initial Training Period

Delegates agreed that initial training was of capital importance and continuing training on a universal basis did not yet exist. They expressed the hope that initial and continuous training could be planned everywhere within the context of lifelong training. While initial training is necessarily related to the education system of each country, delegates agreed that development of "cognitive style" and endowment of the capacity for tolerance and flexibility were universally applicable attributes of training.

The Group considered the need for a common-core of initial training combined with later diversification in areas of specialization as a way to facilitate internal mobility. They agreed that the common-core aspect of training should be part of an integrated post-secondary system. Delegates did not agree on the ideal place for such training, with some pointing to the university as the logical place and others preferring to see it achieved through qualifications which were identical but obtained in different ways.

The Group stressed the importance of practical experience as a way to encourage self-determination and self-selection. Emphasis was also laid on introducing the student-teacher to education research and philosophy of education as a means toward more participation and self-awareness.

3. Further Training

The Group agreed that priority should be given to recurrent education for teachers in the planning and financing of education systems. This continuing training should meet the needs of teachers and administrators as well as the wishes and needs of pupils and their parents. Importance was placed on teacher participation in the planning of such training in order to gain their acceptance of it. Working conditions must be adjusted to correspond with this commitment and appropriate incentives (academic or professional awards, salaries, promotion) should be used by authorities to motivate teachers to participate. Three principal types of continuing training were discussed: (a) further training and retraining in the form of organized sessions, practical courses or even correspondence courses; (b) training as a part of normal school activity, i.e. involving collective self-education organized by teaching teams with the assistance of specialists or advisers attached to teacher support centers; (c) special support measures for beginner teachers so as to ensure a smooth transition from initial training to the exercise of their profession and to continuing training.

Each of these would require adjustment in teachers' workloads, leaves of absence, and the assurance of teachers' rights to take part in accordance with choice and personal need.

4. Institutional Responsibility

Delegates agreed that there was need for greater comprehensiveness within training institutions and for closer interaction between these institutions and the university. They also agreed that adequate coordination was essential between the various functions and responsibilities of institutions involved in initial and continuing training. These changes would require additional expenditures but this would be indispensible if education systems were to meet the needs of the future.

C. COMMENTS FROM AMERICAN DELEGATES

American delegates to Working Group 3 were Dr. Jack P. Nix (President, Council of Chief State School Officers), Dr. William L. Smith (Director, U.S. Teacher Corps), and Dr. Sam P. Wiggins (President, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education).

Dr. Jack P. Nix noted that "the opportunity to spend a week with official representatives from the major educational organizations and those closely associated with the education profession was most helpful in understanding the goals and objectives of each organization. This experience on the part of several United States delegates will serve as a means of improving future communications and build and support an improved and expanded total education program for United States citizens."

Recognition by OECD of education as an essential factor in building a stronger base of economic and cultural activity in each country is tremendously important. Educational opportunities should now receive greater support.

Dr. Nix expressed concern over the "insufficient involvement of parents and lay citizens in the conference, /which/ resulted in little attention being given to the participation of groups other than professionals and policy makers in the decisionmaking process."

In addition he noted that TUAC delegates expressed considerable concern about job security and about paraprofessionals assuming professionals' responsibilities.

Dr. Nix stressed that any evaluation of the significance of the conference had to include recognition of the solid national economic gains produced by comprehensive and effective education. Thus, all questions of increased funding for education should include consideration of return-on-investment. In addition, Dr. Nix emphasized that the increasing costs of education in a period of economic contraction required the selling of the validity and importance of funding requests. These would have to be supported by rationales clearly defining the breadth and comprehensiveness of today's educational services, and the extent to which they affected the broad spectrum of national wellbeing. As the fight for resources intensifies, leaders in education must unite and concentrate their efforts as a common-interest group to win adequate resources for vital tasks. Dr. Nix stressed that CCSSO would strongly support activities working toward future teacher development.

Dr. William L. Smith, as Chairman of Working Group 3, summarized their work at the plenary session of the conference. His report broadly encompasses key points made by delegates.

1. Access to the Teaching Profession

Selection became a focal point of the discussion. On the matter of access to the profession, three critical issues were raised by the delegates.

(1) Self-selection. This was viewed as the most appropriate means for access, more productive of quality than society's need.

(2) Self-orientation. Some delegates felt that self-selection to the profession was less appropriate than self-orientation, which places more responsibility for counseling upon the school and the university in the orientation process. They felt that pre- and initial entry counseling should provide potential candidates with knowledge of the kinds of specializations needed to meet critical national shortages. It was further agreed that counseling from local school authorities is important as a source of inservice support especially in the early tenure of a teacher.

(3) De-selection. The issue of de-selection of candidates was raised in terms of the obligation and responsibility of universities to develop de-selection processes while candidates are in initial training. Rather than putting them out as graduates, only to have school systems de-select or fire them, universities should be able to rechannel or redirect these candidates into appropriate alternative learning opportunities. For candidates at a later stage of training, de-selection should be a matter of joint action of local school authorities and the university. Most European delegates do not wish to deal with de-selection since their universities do not play a role in initial training, nor are they expected to in the near future.

It was finally proposed that the issue of access really related to standards of entry and all delegates agreed that high standards of entry were most essential to the question of access to the teaching profession. The TUAC delegates felt that high entry standards rather than de-selection was really the answer "...as in other professions--medicine, law, etc." It was later pointed out that other professions do outline criteria of incompetency and do carry out de-selection procedures such as disbarment, delicensing, etc.

There was a general consensus for acceptance of the need for initial and continuous education as an ongoing systematic process which fosters lifelong education. There are a number of changes that impact upon teacher education which must be dealt with.

(1) Quantity: the imbalance in the teacher supply and demand has now created more than enough teachers--in general, it is assumed that this surplus will continue in the future It was noted that many teachers of the "shortage" period were middle- or lower-middle class, frequently going into teaching as a second-choice career. Today, in the "surplus" period, candidates are frequently better qualified and see teaching as a first-choice career. Though elitist in tone, this assessment met with general acceptance.

(2) Despite rising standards of teacher preparation, new teachers, still in the minority, must work with colleagues whose long term practice of survival techniques undercut the new teachers' higher level of preparation, since new teachers are still in the minority.

(3) There is a change in our social philosophy leading to genuine notions of universal education. Society, in the past, placed the weight of measuring up upon the children and didn't care much about rejecting them if they didn't measure up. The concern now is that the child get the best from his/her school experience.

(4) Young people are now beginning to evaluate the system. Failure now relates to the relationship between teacher and client (the child).

(5) The teacher must be introduced to the reality of fruitful change. It is the function of the university to analyze and accept the reality of a closer relationship between the school and the university as part of institutional responsibility.

2. Initial Training

There was agreement that the traditional emphasis on cognitive training must be infused with a field-based, experiential modality. Some European delegates felt that there should be mix of older and younger, experienced and inexperienced candidates in the training situation. This hung together with a trend toward positive assessment of team teaching among some of the Europeans. The discussion on teams was inconclusive particularly as it concerned the role of the teacher. The Canadian delegate. however made a productive point with which many agreed. "Teaching is a specific profession with specific skills. The teacher's job is to help pupils to order, organize and synthesize perceptions. We must get away from the idea of the omnicapable teacher."

The issue of standards for initial training evoked considerable debate. It was felt that all initial training should be given through a comprehensive post-secondary system. Some characteristics of this system are that they should be: (1) diversified in nature, (2) uniform in duration, (3) have access to university research, (4) that teacher training institutions and the school must collaboratively design and deliver training, and (5) the university must begin to create inservice and further education training.

A second related issue was whether it is necessary to begin initial training earlier than presently conceived (e.g., in the upper secondary schools) Agreement emerged that a framework must be developed for continuous training within which initial training must be placed. In other words, the two together form a system, and the first step in training of young teachers is really the ongoing training of older teachers. A cadre of talented and well-trained younger teachers cannot change the surrounding mass of older teachers, who may have been trained to lower standards and are practiced in survival techniques.

A third issue has to do with uniformity of training, and the extent to which course content can be dictated in light of the following questions: (1) what is the role of the teacher today? (2) who determines the role? (3) how are objectives specified for these changing roles? (4) what is the mix between general academic education and the methodology, pedagogic, professional and research training? (5) how is vocational or professional training to be evaluated ? and (6) what kinds of strategies are to be employed in the development of initial or pre-service training which include the use of the community as a resource?

The Europeans felt that the involvement of the university in teacher education was a critical issue. The big question was: How does the university benefit by becoming involved in teacher education, since this is a role the university has not traditionally been involved in? A further question was: What are the benefits to either a teacher training institution or a university for becoming involved in inservice training? All these emerged through somewhat inconclusive discussion as matters of widespread concern.

3. Inservice Training

Delegates expressed very diverse views on training; its nature, content, and place of transmission. Some charged that the universities maintained a stranglehold on the process, furnishing their own products on their own premises to the visiting teacher, rather than making a needs analysis within the school and providing the types and intensities of training specifically needed. Others stated that talk of changed or improved training was idle: until the universities could be changed, nothing else would change. TUAC delegates strongly affirmed that training was distinctly a university function, at pre-service and inservice levels, and was a vital catalyst in unifying the profession. They stressed, however, that teachers must exercise a decisive voice in planning the content and delivery of training, as well as negotiating the conditions under which it would be delivered and the compensation paid for teacher participation. They stated that the fullest value of training could only be realized if a school's teachers attended in groups, sought specific skills, and implemented follow-up programs. Other delegates felt that teacher training institutions and schools must collaborate in the design and delivery of training.

The point was made many times that small but rounded groups that would include teachers, administrators, university professors, non-teaching professionals and (an American viewpoint) community representatives would provide a useful forum for problem sharing and developing modified approaches.

The following points solidified in the course of the discussion:

- there is a need for standards for inservice training
- who should determine these standards is a governance issue
- inservice training should be viewed as graduate work in the university in conjunction and in collaboration with the school system and with the teachers
- administrators and teachers of teachers have been long out of the classroom, no longer know the real needs of teachers and are therefore themselves in need of training.
- inservice training may be viewed as:
    remedial - for those whose qualifications do not meet present day entry requirements

    refresher - continuous education for all teachers and administrators

    critical situation - training when a new development or technology comes on the scene.

    promotional opportunities
- management techniques and the supportive function they can serve are poorly understood by all personnel.

Dr. Smith added a formal note to the discussion mentioned above, defining what he felt were the basic requirements of a quality inservice training program. It:

- is brought from the university to the school
- includes a needs analysis
- involves administrators in the training
- takes the school as the unit of change
- addresses behaviors more than attitudes only.

4. Research

A special concern that wove in and out of the general discussion was research. Some delegates posited that teachers were often resistant to research efforts and that such efforts were often obstructed by lack of teacher cooperation.

A TUAC delegate argued that teachers had been inundated by innovations in the guise of "research" or had been undercut by evaluation that had no relation to their own classroom objectives, and therefore what was being called "resistance" was often only the teacher's attempt to "get on with the work."

Consensus was reached that a very important part of inservice and preservice training must be training in understanding of research design, and in the interpretation of results, so that application could become a reality. The TUAC representative stressed the importance of teacher participation in research design and in decisionmaking as to implementation.

Several views pertinent to other issues arose at different times in the working sessions. In the discussion of paraprofessionals, TUAC delegates emphasized that in the employment of paraprofessionals there must be no encroachment upon teachers' professional status, nor any negation of the need for more teachers. A concern of quite another type was voiced by the Canadian delegate who feared that the admission of paraprofessionals into an ill-defined professional environment would result in their assignment to those unrepresented, i.e. pupils who, because of ethnic or socioeconomic background lack a voice in community affairs. Norway's delegate raised a point that served as a useful balance to the large-scale viewpoints expressed in the day. Some of Norway's most rural schools are one-teacher facilities. Therefore these teachers needed to develop cooperative relations with local authorities. Dr. Smith commented that such relationships fell within the team concept and the local authorities could be regarded as a school resource.

Dr. Sam P. Wiggins, President of AACTE noted that the American Delegation, because of its specific makeup was apparently that the most broadly based of any participating in the Conference. All members had made contributions to the U.S. position paper and were prepared to reconvene in the United States for post-conference discussions. These were intended to enable a means of continuing communication to be devised between governmental and non-governmental agencies involved in the planning, delivery and evaluation of education. Such communication, Dr. Wiggins stressed, was essential if any of the key conclusions of the Conference, most of which were supported by the American Delegation, were to be adapted to and implemented in American education.

He felt that the central task of the American Delegates was to develop and maintain interaction among their organizations and with their governmental counterparts. As a result, national policies would derive from "a kind of double-harness." Government and a broadly inclusive range of non-government agencies and organizations would all participate in long-range planning and implementation of jointly developed goals in education, jointly accountable to the citizenry.

VII. WORKING GROUP 4: CONSEQUENCES FOR COSTS AND PLANNING

A. SUMMARY OF "DISCUSSION PAPER" PREPARED BY OECD SECRETARIAT

The Problem

Cost implications of the measures referenced in the first three discussion papers are indistinct. Available data and conceptual frameworks are weak. The elements of the education system are interdependent and it is difficult to analyze teacher policies apart from the overall functioning of the system in terms of costs. This difficulty has slowed down the planning and coordinating process for policy decisions.

The costing out of innovations is equally problematic. Direct linkages between expenditures and results are difficult to formulate, the more so when costs may be disguised insofar as shared facilities, loaned personnel, and community resources are involved.

1. The Difficulty of Relating Results to Costs

Lack of detailed data and research make it impossible to endorse one mode of development over another. There is a fairly general context of increasing costs for teaching staffs. Administrators question whether proposed innovations will either: reduce costs while attempting to maintain previous results; improve results while not exceeding previous costs levels; or improve results at a cost higher than the improvement warrants.

Certain Member countries, particularly the United States, have tried to construct, within a framework of values and objectives, techniques for relating results to the costs of the resources involved. Would it be possible, on the basis of their practical experience, for these countries to draw up a balance sheet of obstacles encountered and possible ways of overcoming them?

2. Possible Reduction of Certain Costs (Maintaining or Reducing Certain Costs; Economies of Scale; the Phasing out of Certain Measures)

What innovations can be implemented at minimum additional cost through ensuring flexible use of time and personnel within existing statutory requirements and appropriate use of less highly paid personnel in auxiliary functions? Economies of scale may be achieved in the use of facilities and technologies. For instance, teacher training institutions might be consolidated. Expensive technologies could be made accessible to multiple users. Investment in use of new media should be made on a scale large enough to allow use of program material by a large number of persons thus minimizing unit cost.

As in the American model, economies in plant and facilities might be made by extending their use throughout the calendar year. Although education costs do not decrease, total societal costs may be lowered by making education facilities available to the community. The current teacher supply and demand situation makes unnecessary incentives to attract graduates or to retain teachers in the profession.

Measures Which Necessarily Imply A Cost Increase

Certain innovations which enhance the status of teachers and require improved facilities will require higher expenditures. Teacher Centers (British) and Centers for the Documentation of Pedagogy (French), seen as essential to the improvement of education, require new funding, as do the equivalent institutions in other nations. Proper recognition of the need for additional teachers and other adjunct professionals will prove costly. Extensive planning will be required if all innovations and enhancement measures mentioned are to be optimally integrated within existing structures and are to offer the maximum benefit to the schools, their staffs, pupils and the community.

There is a need for interface groups (teacher-planners, teacher groups and the profession as a whole) at different administrative and political levels. Qualitative data must be made more available if nations are to make and compare progressive policies. In addition, if short- or medium-term measures are to remain compatible with long term needs, various elements of the planning process must be logically interconnected. Education planning must be intersectoral with broader social planning.

B. SUMMARY OF "REPORT OF GROUP DISCUSSION" PREPARED BY OECD RAPPORTEUR, WORKING GROUP 4

1. Link Between Costs and Benefits (Pupils and Community; Teachers; Centralization and Decentralization; Individualization of Teaching and Costs)

In accepting that cost increases were virtually universal in education, delegates agreed that more rigorous analysis of the links between costs and benefits was required. Yet the definition of expected outcomes from investments in education in a changing society posed difficulties. Delegates observed that grading systems and the evaluation of cognitive achievement were in a state of flux.

Delegate opinion on the comparative value of investment in preservice and inservice training differed: the Swiss voiced concern over the money-and-time costs of preservice training; the Irish stressed that improved performance provided a return on investment from continued inservice training.

In general, delegates felt that increased costs of a decentralized system (as in the United States) were returned. Users (parents, policymakers, pupils) are more effectively associated with the system, and the efficiency of schools is higher. Many delegates noted that operational streamlining in their own nations tended to require a separation between planners and those planned for--pupils, parents and teachers. Planning from above is efficient, but does not take account of needs felt at user level. The Danish delegate pointed out that individualization of instruction meant higher costs and more complicated planning.

2. Demand For Teachers (Size of Classes; Qualifications of Teachers; Responsibility for Planning)

Certain delegates felt that optimal class size should be determined so that the number of teachers could be mathematically deduced from the number of pupils. Others felt that optimal class size would not reflect a nation's total teacher and class situation. Surpluses or shortages could exist in specific subject areas and in particular geographical regions.

A divergence developed between union delegates and delegates with planning responsibilities over the issue of class size, with the unions defending the utility of the teacher/pupil ratio.

The use of paraprofessionals as teacher aides to increase productivity while restraining costs were debated. The Trade Union Advisory Council (TUAC) delegates suggested that this policy could become the thin edge of a dangerous wedge.

On the issue of responsibility for planning, the American delegation described a theoretical model in which objectives and general standards were laid down by the central authority and planning built up from below. Many delegates, especially those from the United Kingdom, felt that this was not realistic.

3. Sectoral and Intersectoral Planning (Size of Schools; Role of Teachers and Planning)

The basic point which emerged from the discussions was that the community expects different services from schools and teachers than in the past.

The size vs. cost issue (normally leading to fewer and bigger schools with real or supposed economies of scale) was intensively discussed. Several countries, particularly Norway and Canada, consider that the superior education from small schools is more important than its cost. Others noted that a proliferation of one-school books-and-materials requirements would not be willingly handled by publishers and manufacturers geared to mass markets.

In the discussion of the role of teachers in planning, a number of divergencies emerged. Union representatives felt that teachers within the school should play a leading part in planning and that it be done during time released from teaching. Others commented that planning from below might not reflect more broadly felt community and national needs. The Swedish delegate stated that many teachers in his country prefer to leave local planning to their organizations.

C. COMMENTS FROM AMERICAN DELEGATES

The American delegates to Working Group 4 were Mr. Robert H. McBride (President, National Association of State Boards of Education; Chairman of the Policy Committee, Education Commission of the States) and Dr. Garry McDaniels (Director, Programs on Teaching and Curriculum, National Institute of Education, DHEW).

Mr. McBride stated that he considered the informal problem sharing and discussion opportunities the conference afforded to be of more value than the formal sessions. These, because of the widely differing educational philosophies of the participants, were frequently unfocused or poorly directed.

He noted that Denmark was attempting to face a key problem in open access to higher education, that of the perpetual student indulging in a curriculum lacking an adequate range of vocational training courses and thus not fulfilling a solidly useful purpose.

In terms of change and innovation, Mr. McBride emphasized that unless proper participatory processes were established, useful change would not be realized. In broadening the participatory basis, as in other decentralizing activities, he felt Europe had much to learn from the United States.

Planning for change and for more effective education could best be based upon limiting the number of priorities and by increasing the input of teachers, pupils, parents and community leaders into planning of the individual school. The school is the most practical entity for which planning can be done. Florida and Hawaii had, to different extents and at different levels, introduced broadly based participatory models in education; however, the much-discussed British open infant and secondary schools were not as participatory as generally assumed. Individual decisionmaking, rather than jointly arrived at approaches, were the norm.

Dr. McDaniels saw three aspects of the Conference as having particular value. First, the comments of the conferees indicated substantial levels of information and misinformation about education in the United States.

He suggested that..."U.S. representatives, other than the advocates of particular innovations, must provide reasonably analytic statements of the U.S. experience... Meetings such as this one provide one vehicle; however, commissions might be empanelled by agencies such as the NIE to provide a "white paper" on major U.S. innovations."

Secondly, he noted, hearing OECD members' descriptions of education, research, policy and practice in their own countries cleared up many American misconceptions. The meetings provided an opportunity to question several of the delegates somewhat closely about the practices represented by their philosophical descriptions of their education systems. Some unique research was reported at the Conference, and papers describing this research have been requested by NIE.

Thirdly, numerous research and policy issues of current interest to Member nations were identified by national delegates and TUAC representatives. Little communication exists among the agencies stimulating research in OECD countries. Waste, duplication, and time would be saved if some minimum of common goals were monitored by OECD nations.

VII. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS: PREPARED BY OECD RAPPORTEUR

It was one of the merits of the Conference that it brought together policymakers, planners and practitioners in the Member countries together with representatives of teacher unions in a dialogue on problems of common and immediate interest.

The opening session made it clear that this Conference was concerned with an area of central economic importance. Even the lowest estimates suggest that teacher costs amount to some 70 per cent of the current expenditures of most school systems. At a time of renewed financial stringency, the importance of this figure cannot be ignored in any consideration of education arrangements.

But it was equally evident that the Conference was concerned with an area of great political sensitivity and was, therefore, not going to be a succession of easily accepted platitudes, agreed scenarios and consensus resolutions. The Conference theme led directly to the political nature of education; to the real world in which group interests are in conflict and professional and personal positions are at risk. It was made clear in the opening session that not only teachers' organizations but also ministries and schools, not to mention parents and pupils, have their own positions that, at times, are widely divergent. (Whether OECD has or has not its own position too was a matter that exercised many participants.)

Sharpened by this economic and political sensitivity, the debate has been clear, direct and effective. Above all, as our Chairman perceptively predicted, it was about power, its nature, its availability and its exercise. Delegates spoke frequently and convincingly of their realization that, for children, education was the key to decision-making and power in society. Yet, if education is the key to power, how is it that educationalists, though holding the key, so often lack the economic and political power they need, especially in the contemporary financial climate when the allocation of scarce resources to the education system has, in many cases, to be fought for de nouveau? The fight for resources and the way in which teachers may be equipped to participate in the new conditions was a central theme of discussions in all groups. A few members looked nostalgically for a recurrence of the "golden days" of the 1960's when there was a combination of economic growth, an unquestioning call for almost unlimited increases in provision of education and rapid development on all fronts.

But most took a less buoyant view. The more pessimistic saw a fall in resources that was at least as steep as the fall in pupil numbers; the more optimistic saw a situation in which resources might remain at more or less their present level, despite falling numbers. Few were confident that there would be adequate allowances for the cost inflation affecting all countries represented at the Conference.

In the light of such discussions, it was hardly surprising that delegates spent some time reaffirming the fundamental nature of the contributions of teachers in mobilizing talent, distributing opportunity, eliminating inequality and much else. But they also proceeded in all groups to more precise affirmations--that the labor intensity of teaching is justified, that teachers can unmistakably be seen to be efficient, effective and productive. Some even felt it necessary to reaffirm the essential nature of schools and schooling. Predictably, there was much rehearsal of the important arguments concerning class size, paraprofessionals, inservice opportunities, etc.

Yet if the new aims for education--the achievement of independence, decisionmaking and self-selection by pupils and the new relationships with parents--are realistic and if the new roles of teachers (that were endorsed in all groups) are effective in bringing them about, an unavoidable consequence is that we have to concern ourselves not only with teacher power but also with the power of parents and pupils. And the development of community education strategies also opens up the wider perspectives of community involvement in the process of schooling (as Bolam's background paper made clear). The dilemma of the teacher who is obliged to strengthen his position in order to introduce strategies that may weaken it, formed an underlying yet central theme to the group discussions.

In light of this shared background, it was not surprising that the fundamental issues raised by the four groups had much in common. Though the style and pace of the debate varied widely, as the group reports show, some of the major issues may be brought together as follows:

1. The Identity of the Teacher. All groups shared impressive agreement about the fundamentals of the new role of the teacher. It is unnecessary to record the new dimensions--the development of individuality, creativity and judgement; pastoral care and guidance; flexible approaches such as team teaching participation and integrated curricula--all of these are clearly familiar. The paradox that faced all the groups was that at a time when to members of the Conference diverse and expressive roles was almost universally approved it was also necessary for the roles to be defined with a greater precision and firmness than at almost any time in recent history. There were two reasons for this call for precision:

a. The belief that teachers with a clear articulation of their role could be more effective in negotiating the establishment of their position and in claiming resources adequate to perform it effectively; in short that an unambiguous and recognized position is likely to be more effective in the contemporary economic and political climate.

b. The belief that a clear consciousness of one's role is essential for professional performance. As one delegate put it "confused people are ineffective." A number of speakers talked of "anxiety neurosis" amongst teachers undertaking new responsibilities; recent Swiss research suggests that even experienced teachers lacked confidence in new situations.

There was general agreement that there is a need for clear identity without uniformity. But there was by no means a clear indication of the way in which the new specifications mught be drawn. As however most delegates seemed to have, in their minds, examples of teachers who are performing the new roles in an obviously competent manner, it should not be impossible to draw up a representative range of profiles for reference.

2. The Professional Arrangements That Can Lead To Appropriate Teacher Identity. On a number of occasions delegates reminded groups that existing training arrangements did not always lead to the desired new identities in either initial training or, as Shipman reminds us in one of the background papers, inservice education. There was broad agreement of the need to recruit a range of entrants to the profession from diverse backgrounds. There was also agreement, in principle, on the new type of integrated, often multitechnic, establishments in which training might be more effectively offered, not only for teachers but for other professions, and consensus on the value of the links with other professions and the retention of career choices for students. There was consensus on the way in which the management of these institutions be broadened to include wide representation by practicing members of the profession. There was less clarity on the nature of the diversity of the products of such establishments, however. There was also a notable lack of consideration of the way in which the new kinds of training institutions, including inservice institutions, might be staffed, and of the teaching techniques and strategies that might be adopted therein. How, for example, should a curriculum serving the needs of teachers and social workers be devised and taught? In what way should school teachers helping to provide inservice training work with the teachers released for such training. In view of its central importance there seems to be an urgent need for consideration of the new teaching roles in these new establishments. Without it can consideration of the new teaching roles into schools be other than incomplete and unrealizable? But it is not only training but also the structure of the profession that influences diversity. The groups considered the extent to which the profession itself could "institutionalize" the new diverse roles. There was considerable indication that, at this time of economic hazard there was reluctance to have a range of adults or even teachers with different status in the schools. In three groups the discussion focused on "paraprofessionals." There was a majority view for "polarization"--either the paraprofessionals were eliminated in all but the most stringently defined cases, or else assimilated through "full processes of professional selection, training and certification" to become teachers with full status and recognition. Overall there appeared to be acceptance of only two categories of persons in the school--teachers and pupils. It may be that the Plenary Session can usefully discuss the extent to which this firmly held position may be reconciled with the diversity of professional roles.

3. The Demand For Teachers. The problem of quantifying and subsequently costing the demand for teachers in the new conditions was a dominant

theme in most groups. Much of the debate centered around the class size issue and the "traditional" and "mechanical" way in which this was seen to be used as a measure of the demand for teachers. It was generally agreed that, though class size was still important, many other factors in the new roles of teachers most certainly were also important--guidance and pastoral work, etc., and should be counted. Australian delegates reported that in Victoria State, numbers of teachers were calculated to allow one-third of non-teaching time in which other professional duties might be undertaken. Overall, though, the problems of calculating demand were seen to be of immense difficulty in the redefined nature of the teachers' role. Yet it was agreed that because of the demands of economic situations they were of overriding importance. The uselessness of overall "head counting" was generally accepted; for example there might be an overall "excess" of teachers, yet an acute shortage of much needed specialist competence. Yet whilst more specific indices were called for, their nature was left imprecise. It may be that the possibility of more exact calculations could be elaborated by further discussion during the Plenary Session, though inevitably they must largely await the more precise delineation of the teacher's role that has already been discussed.

It was however generally agreed that there could be little progress in quantified assessment of teacher effectiveness: the widespread dissatisfaction with most existing measures such as examination performance was unmistakeable, most forcefully expressed by some of the Norwegian delegates. Instead, attention was given to other forms of assessments on criteria such as the nature of the services provided and the quality of interrelationship achieved. It was also suggested that some progress could be made in attempting to make simple comparisons at the "micro" level, for example, to compare the advantages of, say, 5 days attendance at school instead of 4; the differences in outcome between more or less laboratory or studio accomodation in the secondary school and so on. There was considerable support for "simplistic" answers to the question. There was much support for the delegate who pointed out that every teacher has to "know if he's done it when he has done it." Every teacher has to evaluate his work at the end of a lesson, a day or a week if he is to survive. It may be that "simplistic" studies of teacher evaluation could still throw considerable light on these issues--perhaps more than some of the more ambitious measurement studies of the past. It was recognized, nonetheless, that it is unlikely that a clear relationship between costs and productivity in the school system can ever be achieved, nonetheless there was an urgent realization that existing evidence was insufficient.

4. The Role of the Teacher and Education Planning. Considerations of planning demand were an inevitable prelude to the wider considerations of planning. The fundamental importance of this activity was seen to be beyond question though groups found themselves often overwhelmed by the difficulties and on occasion found skillful ways of avoiding the issue. Yet two major contributions emerged, each with widespread support:

a. The involvement of teachers in fundamental planning in a "bottom up" strategy. There was considerable evidence of the greater efficacy and desirability of this approach as opposed to the more usual "top down" strategy, even though it was recognized to be a vastly more difficult process to initiate and to support. Within the context of the conference discussion it was seen to be particularly attractive as it tended to offer a valuable line of support for the strengthening of teachers' identities and professional roles. A widely endorsed strategy was the consideration by teachers in their various groupings of priorities and potential "sacrificed alternatives" in the use of resources. It was envisaged that, in this "micro" planning teachers may be well able to establish and justify "shopping lists" in a particularly effective manner.

b. The interrelationship of education planning with other areas--public provision in "inter-sectoral" planning strategies--embracing aspects of health, employment, etc. The case for the elimination of isolated "education planning" was effectively presented and widely supported in Group 4. This group explored the way in which school size is determined and noted that the standard for what is considered a desirable size school is derived from objectives which include social and economic concerns in the community and for the nation as a whole, thus the intersectoral framework in which, in reality, education is planned was neatly illustrated.

The Plenary Session may feel able to consider some of the possibilities of these approaches, with their strategies that are radically different from most existing analyses and may perhaps wish to indicate the desirability of their further exploration in the wider context of other OECD studies.

In these points of synthesis the group returned regularly once again to the central issues with which the conference began, economic and political power. But they have also made it clear that power cannot be grasped or used without the sharper identity, process, analysis and planning that we have discussed. If we are to maintain or to enhance the position of education in our current society, the capacity to present a coherent and rationally supported argument with a clear understanding of priorities and objectives is essential. Viewed in these terms the conference has not been a luxury; rather it has been an urgent necessity.

FIRST POST-CONFERENCE MEETING

San Francisco, California

January 23-25, 1975

FIRST POST-CONFERENCE MEETING OF U.S. DELEGATES TO OECD
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
JANUARY 23-25, 1975

The first session was called for the evening of January 23rd. At that time the delegates received (1) the two-day Agenda, (2) the U.S. Delegation Report and (3) the report for UNESCO's International Bureau of Education-sponsored conference on Teacher Education to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, in September, 1975. The Delegation was asked to serve as a national Committee of Correspondence for that conference. Since the focus of the IBE conference is related to that of the OECD's, much was extracted from the basic research commissioned for the OECD report. The major difference was in format rather than substance, with the exception of additional requirements regarding research and technology. Major points from the OECD Conference were included as reference material in the IBE report. The draft U.S. Delegation report to the Commissioner of Education included the background material on OECD, the process used for the development of the U.S. submission to the Paris Conference and finally, a section on each of the working groups. Each section contained: (1) a summary of the OECD Secretariat Discussion Paper, (2) a summary of the Group Reports, (3) personal comments from the U.S. delegates who attended each working group, and (4) the OECD conference summary document by Dr. Eggleston, the general conference rapporteur.

On Friday morning the delegates listened to and discussed the NIE presentation of a "Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study." This NIE-funded study is being conducted by the California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. The Commission contracted with the FarWest Laboratories for Educational Research and Development to do the research during the 1974-75 and 1975-76 school years: Educational Testing Services completed the first year of research responsibility during the 1973-74 school year.

The delegates discussed the unique structure of the Commission and its relationship to the State Legislature and the State Department of Education at considerable length. An equal amount of time was devoted to the actual three-phase research activities.

During the afternoon the delegates mapped out future plans for the delegation as a whole. These include a meeting with the Commissioner of Education on March 18, 1975. Mr. Swain noted in this context that greater understanding among the American organizations had come out of the Paris conference--from delegates' agreements and from their disagreements. Mr. Shanker had commented in Paris that historically some organizations have used media to express their displeasure with other organizations. As a result, the media has projected to the public an image of conflict and disunity in education, generating a sense that inadequacy pervades the field. Areas of genuine agreement among educators and their organizations have gone unreported. Dr. Nix stressed the need for educators to band together and create a new image of unity to re-sell education expenditures to taxpayers. Delegates agreed that their common interests required continuous collective work. The OECD experience had done much to point out that broad areas of common agreement existed among the separate organizations and their leadership.

Dr. Wiggins emphasized the need to get as much information as possible before the public through the speaking engagements and organizational activities of delegates. The involvement of key people able to help in strategic areas was essential. The newly formed Commission of Intercultural Education of the AACTE would be one such group to be kept informed of delegation activities; the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and its affiliates, such as the Associated Organizations of Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators are others. In this context, Mrs. Herndon suggested that parent workshops be considered. Upcoming organization conferences and Executive Board meetings were seen as valuable forums for presenting Delegation activities and for becoming attuned to the work, position, and outlook of other groups in education. Dr. Smith suggested that periodic retreats for the Delegation should be considered as a means of exchanging information and broadening perspectives. Presentations similar to the NIE "Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study" could be made. Possible topics could include latest information on early childhood education, Teacher Centers, and other developing areas.

The meeting with Commissioner Bell will be the occasion of the presentation of the U.S. Delegates' Report on the Teacher Policies Conference. The delegation asked that the Commissioner be pre-briefed on the report so delegates could discuss substantive next steps with him.

The morning briefing indicated that much work needed to be done together on two levels: (1) future briefings for delegates in critical areas of education, and (2) follow-up national activities growing out of the international conference. Four 1976 regional conferences for the delegates' organizations, with NIE and USOE as co-sponsors, were proposed. A general title, "The U.S. Bicentennial Conference for Future Teacher Development", was posited. Participation of representatives from teacher groups, administrators, lay boards, parents, chairmen of the House and Senate education committees, State departments of education, institutions of higher education, USOE and NIE were proposed. Presentations from both the United States and foreign countries were recommended.

Dr. Nix proposed as Regional Conference Agendas, discussions of (1) present status or practices in teacher development, (2) new practices, (3) current experimental activities, (4) international activities, and (5) implications for future teacher development practices. Delegates agreed, wherever possible to provide speakers from the Delegation for significant organizational conferences throughout the country. Two objectives would be implemented: (1) provide information about the Paris conference and its implications and (2) solicit help from the different organizations in planning for and involvement in the regional conferences.

The possibility of a National Conference and an International Conference as an outgrowth of these plans was discussed. These would be held in the United States during the Bicentennial Year. A considerable amount of time was devoted to working through themes, formats and procedures. Delegates stressed the need to explore professional education centers, teacher centers, inservice education, and early childhood education--all of which could be included in conference designs. The presidents agreed to have staff members meet with Dr. Smith to plan for the regional conferences.

On Saturday the delegates analyzed and critiqued the draft report. Working Group participants recommended changes to be included in the final draft. This will be sent to the delegates by March 10.

The Delegation adjourned.

CALENDAR OF ORGANIZATIONS' CONVENTIONS

MONTHS WEEKS	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
1		ATE Annual Mtg. Feb. 5-8 New Orleans			NASBE May 3-6 Phoenix, Arizona	NCOPT June 1-4 Atlantic City, N.J.	NEA Annual Mtg. July 3-8 Los Angeles Calif.					
2		NEA Conference on Neglect Feb. 15 Wash., D.C.		NASBE Apr. 7-10 Virgin Islands		CCSSO Mtg. with O.E. June 11-13 Wash., D.C.	AFT Annual Mtg. July 10-17 Hawaii			NASBE Oct. 9-12 New Orleans Louisiana		
3			ASCD Mar. 15-19 New Orleans U.S. Deleg. Mtg. with Comm. Bell Mar. 18 Wash., D.C.	NSBA Apr. 19-22 Miami, Fla.			Teacher Corps Development Conference July 20-25				CCSSO Nov. 16-19 Wash., D.C.	
4	U.S. Deleg. to OECD 1st Post Conf. Mtg. Jan. 23-25 San Francisco	AASA Feb. 21-24 Dallas, Tx. AACTE Feb. 26 - Mar. 1 Chicago, Ill		AFT QUEST Conference Apr. 25-28 Chicago, Ill			CCSSO Retreat July 24 - Aug. 1 Laconia, N.H.					
5												

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSIONER

Submitted March 18, 1975

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE OECD

Education, even more than society in general, is in a state of flux. Sweeping attacks have been made against the existing system; significant weaknesses have been revealed. Yet, never before has there been so great a committment to change and improvement, such rigorous self-examination on the part of those providing education or so great a concern for comprehensiveness and quality on the part of those whose children are receiving education.

The U.S. Delegation to the OECD Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies, Paris, 1974, join in offering to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Terrell H. Bell, the most urgent of their comments and recommendations.

In General

The OECD Conference, in confirming to the delegate organizations the extent of their common interests, did much to lay a foundation for needed continuing collective work.

The delegates met for the first time as a national group at an international conference. Not only did they learn together of the experiences in education of other nations, but--removed from home pressures--they also learned much about their own organizational problems and aspirations. They returned home much more aware of the constraints under which their colleagues function as organizational representatives. At home, political necessities require the projection of specific and indentifiable organizational positions. The media are prone to sieze upon the consistent differences of viewpoint among them, leaving areas of genuine agreement and joint effort unreported, and generating an image of disunity and contentiousness. This is continuing into a time when the public is expressing increasing dissatisfaction with the results and costs of education. The image, therefore, becomes a suggestion that confusion and inadequacy pervade the field.

The average citizen has difficulty comprehending the significance of human development in a tremendously changing society in terms of demands for a greater share of the tax dollars. Since education touches the lives of more individuals than any other public service, it is constantly being attacked for its inadequacies. Therefore, strategies must be developed for including all aspects of society in education planning and evaluation. Only with this expanded involvement will education be able to obtain the necessary public support to assure sufficient funding to provide an adequate education for all individuals.

Among themselves, educators must now develop a tangible unity and stress common aims in justifying education expenditures to the consumer. The Delegates therefore recommend that this unity of purpose receive public recognition and that the Delegation's collective work to date be further fostered through a series of regional conferences, a national conference and a possible international conference to be held in the United States during the Bicentennial Year, in which both Government and national organizations work together.

International participation will be planned for in each of these conferences so that all participants can receive the benefits of each other's national experiences in education problem solving. Further, the regional context assures a broad dissemination of international exchange and enhances the possibility of attendance by active practitioners--outcomes that the delegates consider of great value and importance.

The Planning and Management of Education

Teachers must be participants in all conferences and other major activities addressing the content, management and future of education. They must be enabled to participate in all stages--from planning to final report and implementation. They must accept corresponding responsibility for the outcomes of such activities.

Teachers must participate in research on optimal class size.

Education goals and objectives must be clearly stated, readily understood and measurable.

Education policymakers and planners must focus on serving their clients--the children in the schools--rather than merely respond to legislative or bureaucratic mandates.

The Teacher's Professional Status

Policymakers and planners must provide teachers with adequate opportunity to participate in education policymaking and planning, to determine the content of curriculum, to share in the design, implementation and evaluation of education innovations and to train in the new technologies.

Planners must recognize and consider the previous professional and life experience of late entrants into the teaching profession in planning their pre-service and continuing education.

New Roles for Teachers and Administrators

New aims for education such as achievement of independence and decision-making by pupils; new community alliances; new views of community as resource; all require new roles of teachers and administrators in which parent power, pupil power and teacher power must be recognized, constructively accepted and used in the planning and management of education.

Broader Service

Education must be recognized as a lifelong process. It is a basic right of all, including institutionalized populations. It is affected by and affects social conditions and economic change. Education should encompass academic and other areas, including values, attitudes, citizenship and the development of employment skills.

Teachers must have the opportunity to extend the range of their skills and experience and to extend the range and types of populations they address.

No teacher should be considered "surplus" until all the education needs of the whole population are being met.

The Education Community and Government: A Necessary Alliance

In summary, the Delegation feels the Conference to have been of great value as a forum for formal presentations and for informal contacts. Through the former, new perspectives were gained; through the latter, new perceptions of aims and aspirations held in common. Of especial value was the opportunity for several or all of the delegate organizations to join their leadership strengths in continuing efforts toward the renewal and improvement of education.

In addition, the Conference afforded a unique opportunity for the forging of a Government-National Education Organizations partnership--essential in meeting the challenge of quality education for all.

The Delegation urgently requests the support, the opportunities and the forums to meet at intervals in the future--as a Government-National Education Organizations group--under the leadership of the Commissioner of Education.

Only through such meetings can the joint efforts made to date, which the Delegation considers vital in meeting present crises and future challenges, be sustained.

Report on

PRESENTATION TO THE COMMISSIONER

Washington, D.C.

March 18, 1975

REPORT ON SECOND POST-CONFERENCE OECD DELEGATION MEETING

MARCH 18, 1975

The Delegation's luncheon meeting with Commissioner Terrell H. Bell convened on March 18, 1975 at the L'Enfant Plaza Hotel. The Commissioner was delayed, testifying before the Senate Committee on higher education appropriations and luncheon began before his arrival. As the White House presentation of the Presidential Citation to the Teacher of the Year was occurring simultaneously, the Commissioner designated his Executive Deputy Commissioner to attend that function. Dr. Jack Nix, as president of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) was committed to attend the White House luncheon and therefore could not meet with the Delegation and the Commissioner. Mr. James Harris, president of the National Education Association (NEA), also absent, delegated Dr. Robert McClure to represent him. Dr. McClure had previously represented Mr. Harris at the August OECD pre-conference meeting and largely authored NEA's contribution to the U.S. position paper for the OECD Conference.

Upon Dr. Bell's arrival, followed by that of Dr. Elam Hirschler, his Special Assistant (also attending the Senate hearings), the Delegation moved toward the formal part of the meeting. The Commissioner had previously received copies of (1) the Executive Summary, (2) the OECD Conference Report, (3) the January Meeting Report and (4) Recommendations of the Delegation. The OECD Conference Report included all comments of each organization president, plus those of Dr. McDaniels, representing NIE and of Dr. Smith on the Conference itself.

Dr. Smith opened by requesting that Dr. Robert Leestma (Associate Commissioner for International Education, Office of Education) formally present the Delegation Report to the Commissioner. Dr. Leestma congratulated the Commissioner for his selection of Dr. Smith and the eight Delegates who attended the Conference. He thanked Optimum Computer Systems, Inc. (OCS), OE's conference management contractor, for its document preparation and timely services throughout the pre-conference and conference periods, and for its facilitation of travel logistics for a group of American scholars convening in Honolulu and Japan. Dr. Leestma suggested to the Commissioner that in light of OCS's productivity in these demanding endeavors, the Office of Education might beneficially use similar services in support of other projects.

Dr. Leestma closed by pointing out that the United States' participation in the OECD Conference has been the most productive international activity sponsored by the Office of Education; the record showed the United States Delegation to be among the most significant contributors to the work of the Conference.

Members of the Delegation then shared their perceptions of the Conference. All thanked the Commissioner for the opportunity of working together in an international and national effort of this importance. They stressed the need for followup activities and for committing themselves and their organizations to cohensive planning and discussion in areas critical to the improvement of national education. Dr. Smith noted that service as leader of the Delegation had been his richest professional experience in the Federal Government.

Dr. McDaniels (NIE) commented on the rewards of having personally met and come to know the presidents of the organizations making up the Delegation. He was pleased to have introduced the NIE California "Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study" to them and hoped delegates would be receptive to additional projects slated for later discussion.

Mr. Swain observed that Paris had provided an open forum in which delegates gained a greater awareness of the pressures that, in part, governed organizational viewpoints expressed at home. He hoped that this greater interorganizational understanding would pave the way for joint action where possible, and nonhostile opposition where not.

Mrs. Herndon pointed out that she was the only parent organization representative invited to the conference and that other Member countries were impressed with the importance accorded in the United States to parental involvement in the development of education policy. She noted that the National Congress of Parents and Teachers was already active in fields of interest to other delegate organizations and welcomed the opportunity for future cooperative work.

Mr. Shanker emphasized to the Commissioner the value and the necessity of increased inter-organizational unity. The public should not make the mistake of undervaluing education in a period of economic downturn when, in fact, the public good remained damaged by many unmet education needs. The delegate organizations were now able to talk to each other--it was vital that they move on to continuing cooperative effort.

Mr. Amundson referred to the Delegation's wish to hold conferences on "futures in teacher development." AASA was in strong support of improving professional preparation and inservice training of all education personnel, including school board members, administrators, and teachers. AASA's strongest interest lies in the positive effect of this improvement on the quality of the children's learning experience. To this end, AASA was prepared to host a Delegation-sponsored conference on these topics at their February 1976 Atlantic City Conference. Conferences of this kind, with inputs ranging from local to international, were an example of the contribution to education the Delegation could make once its continuing existence was assured.

Dr. Wiggins referred to the pre-OECD Conference meeting in August 1974, where the value of followup to the Conference was originally discussed. The Commissioner had at that time committed himself to support followup: it was now worth noting that in light of the potential strengths arising from increased unity among the delegation organizations such activities would be even more beneficial than anticipated.

Mr. McBride in agreeing that the Conference had been of great value, addressed the delegates' prime concern: the need for long term followup.

Dr. McClure said that while he had not gone to Paris, he was gratified to see that some attention had been paid in the report to strengthening the teacher's role.

Dr. Bell then responded to the Delegation, expressing appreciation for their work and his pleasure in reading the outcomes of the Delegation's efforts. In light of the presentation and work done to date he saw a significant need for the group to continue its activities and promised support for at least the coming year. He felt that the Paris Conference had given rise in the Delegation to an awareness of the need to continue to work together to meet critical challenges in American education, and a professional commitment to do so.

The Commissioner then spoke of his testimony at the Senate Committee hearing that day, and outlined to the Delegation some issues in American education that he, as Commissioner, considered to be most urgent. He also indicated the desire of the President that the Office of Education move toward the planning and implementation of the coming White House Conference on Education, and he encouraged the delegates to contribute.

Dr. Wiggins responded that the Delegation was interested in development of plans for the White House Conference on education and wished to participate as fully as possible. The Delegation hoped that government-initiated planning would be bipartisan so that conference goals could be fulfilled despite possible changes in national leadership. If this bipartisan foundation were laid at the outset and consciously sustained thereafter, the conference itself would then be able to reflect the unity of effort in the public and private sectors, to which the OECD Delegation and the USOE were clearly committed.

The Commissioner considered that the proposed retreats at which delegates would be briefed on critical issues in American education were an excellent idea, and offered to join them on occasion, for the opportunity of face-to-face discussion and interaction. He also expressed his special concern for life-long education with its significant early childhood component and, on the professional side, mid-career retraining for educators and school administrators.

Delegates discussed the Commissioner's topics with him until he left to continue his Senate Committee testimony. Dr. Smith then defined the following tasks:

(1) Identify staff for pre-conference planning
(2) Meet to discuss conference inputs
(3) Discuss leadership transitions in delegate organizations
(4) Discuss broadening the circle of organizations.
(5) Specify retreat topics (e.g., McDaniels' NIE presentation)

Many of the delegates were planning to go to the Early Childhood Conference in Denver, so the Delegation's next meeting was planned to dovetail with it. The Early Childhood Conference is sponsored by some 10 organizations, among which are: USOE (regional), the Education Commission of the States, AASA, CCSSO and NSBA. In response to a query from Dr. McClure, it was agreed that presidents unable to attend would designate representatives.

Delegates agreed to widen the 8-delegate circle by including incoming presidents-elect, and by retaining Delegation members as affiliates for one year after their departure from office. This would provide continuity of organization and of process as well as support incoming members.

The regional conferences were then discussed. Mr. Shanker suggested that viewpoints on early childhood education be gathered and explored before June. In response to a question from Dr. Smith about the need for outside expertise, Mr. Shanker stated that such expertise was probably available within the Delegation organizations. Discussion then touched upon selection of countries for input and selection of persons to contribute papers.

Dr. McDaniels suggested a comparative, cross-national study on inservice education. Teachers, teacher educators and administrators should participate. He proposed that one of the regional conferences focus on inservice education, with international input. He also spoke of the need for collection of international information on continuing education and its distribution in the U.S. for the furtherance of teacher and administrative training. Dr. McDaniels noted that he, Dr. Smith, and Mr. Thomas (OECD) were working to integrate these tasks into ongoing activities.

Dr. Smith asked that any delegate comments on early childhood be submitted to Mr. Shanker and Eugenia Kemble, who would coordinate them. Dr. McDaniels similarly agreed to receive comments on inservice education. Dr. Smith asked Mr. Shanker and Dr. McDaniels to outline to the delegates at the May meeting procedures for these tasks. Mrs. Lillie Herndon added that the NCOPT would be focusing on Comprehensive Health Education for grades kindergarten - 12.

Mr. Amundson suggested the consideration of shared decisionmaking and the issue of governance as an area of delegate concern. Mr. Swain emphasized that there should be participation by administrators, teachers, governance people, parents and teacher educators.

Dr. Smith informed delegates that CCSSO had invited them to attend its annual conference in Laconia, New Hampshire on July 27 and 28. There they would discuss with the chiefs the implications of the OECD Conference on educators in mid-career. Dr. Smith invited delegates to discuss the implications of the OECD Conference at the Teacher Corps 9th and 10th Cycle Developmental Conference to be held in Washington, D.C. on July 25. The delegates agreed to attend both of these meetings, make presentations and hold discussions with participants. Delegates would receive last year's Developmental Conference program so they could develop a framework for their participation in the May meetings.

Dr. Wiggins closed by suggesting that the Delegation explore the possibility of AACTE hosting a regional meeting in Chicago in connection with its annual conference. The meeting was then adjourned.